Cambridge Patristic Texts

NOVATIAN
DE
TRINITATE

Cambridge Patristic Texts

GENERAL EDITOR—A. J. MASON, D.D.

MASTER OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

NOVATIANI ROMANAE VRBIS PRESBYTERI

DE TRINITATE LIBER

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER.
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET.

Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS.
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Novatianus

NOVATIANI ROMANAE VRBIS PRESBYTERI

DE TRINITATE LIBER

NOVATIAN'S

TREATISE ON THE TRINITY

EDITED BY

W. YORKE FAUSSET, M.A.,

SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD;
RECTOR OF TIMSBURY AND PREBENDARY OF WELLS.

CAMBRIDGE:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1909

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PATRI REVERENDISSIMO

GEORGIO WYNDHAM

BATHON: ET WELLEN:

EPISCOPO

FIDEI CATHOLICAE IN VTROQVE ORBE PROPAGATORI

PATRIMONII ECCLESIAE ANGLICANAE VINDICI

HOC GRATAE PIETATIS TESTIMONIVM

D.D.D.

VNVS E PRESBYTERIS SVIS

PREFACE

IT is nearly two centuries since a separate edition of Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity was produced by an English clergyman, John Jackson, and published in London. To this editor and his immediate predecessor, Edward Welchman, we are indebted for valuable help towards the emendation of a corrupt vulgate text, in the absence of all manuscript evidence. But they left much still to be done, and the text of the present edition can only claim to mark a further advance towards textual purity. My first duty was to provide an intelligible text, and this, I trust, has been accomplished. The aim of the Commentary has been to make the treatise speak for itself. Criticism and theological dissertation were reserved, in the main, for the Introduction.

The interest of the Treatise, and its importance at the present day, will hardly be questioned. It is at once the earliest systematic treatise on its subject, and the earliest monument of Roman theology. It transports us to a critical period in the history of Christian thought. Then, as now, the battle-ground of contending schools of opinion was the doctrine of the Person of Christ. It may be said of doctrines and formularies with no less truth than it is said of institutions, that the study of

their origins and ordered growth is the surest key to their meaning. There is no better introduction to the study of Christology than the Treatise of Novatian. Much that nowadays to the popular mind is new and modern, is there to be found in germ or tendency. The Divinely-endowed Man of the Adoptianists has reappeared in the Christ of humanitarian theories, and there are modern critics who dissolve the historical Christ into an idea as unsubstantial as the Christ of the Docetic Gnostics. Again, far removed as is the writer's standpoint from that of those who disavow "the dividing line between man's being and God's," he can say that the Word of Christ bestows on man divinity. It may be said in truth, that Novatian is as instructive by his limitations of insight and definition, as he is by his positive contribution to the problems of the Creed. For he is not merely the pale reflexion of Tertullian, as might possibly be inferred from dogmatic writers. The student may think that the Treatise scarcely earns the title which it has come to bear, and it is true that more is said about the unity of the Godhead than about Its tri-personality. But the writer will not allow his sublime conception of the Divine 'monarchia' to exclude that other conviction, which Scripture and experience have rooted in his mind, that Christ is, in a real sense, God as well as Man.

It has not been an easy matter to prepare, at a distance from libraries, an edition requiring constant reference to authorities, and in particular to the earlier printed texts. I am indebted to Mr Falconer Madan, of the Bodleian Library, to Professor Dr Binz of the University Library at Basel, for practical assistance; to Prebendary Goudge for the use of the Wells Theological College Library; and to the Rev. E. G. Meyrick Wood,

Vicar of St Stephen's, Shepherd's Bush, and to the Rev. H. R. Joynt, Rector of Marksbury, for the use of some valuable books; and lastly, to my brother, Mr F. Porter Fausset, of the Inner Temple, who did some useful work for me in the British Museum. But my chief thanks are due to Dr Mason, the General Editor of the Cambridge Patristic Texts. It is not easy to express in a few words what this little book owes to his continuous criticism and encouragement, and, in many passages, to his actual collaboration. I have drawn freely upon his great stores of theological and patristic learning. Many of the interpretations to be found in the Commentary represent the result of prolonged consultation between us; and I have had the privilege of discussing with him the larger aspects of Novatian's theology. This general acknowledgment of Dr Mason's unwearied kindness has to stand in place of any acknowledgment in detail. He has bestowed more pains upon the work of another than some men bestow upon their own.

W. YORKE FAUSSET.

TIMSBURY RECTORY, BATH.
St Thomas' Day, 1908.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

α=cod. Anglicus Pamelii.

γ=Gelenius (Froben, Basel, 1550).

Pa=Pamelii editio 1579.

G=Gangneius (Paris, 1545).

We, Ja, edd. Angl.=E. Welchman (Oxford, 1724) and J. Jackson (London, 1728).

Migne=*Patrologiae Latinae* tom. iii (Paris, 1886).

Latin.=Latinius Viterbiensis ap. Pamelium.

ms. Wow.=a Vatican MS used by J. à Wouwer in his *Emendationes Epidicticae* (Francofurti MDCIII).

Ed. Paris 1545=B. Rhenani operum Q. Sept. Tertulliani editio.

F. Jun.=comments by Franciscus Junius.

INTRODUCTION

'Verius cogitatur Deus quam dicitur, et uerius est quam cogitatur.' (AUG. *de Trinitate.*)

§ 1. *Novatian the Roman presbyter: and the 'Corpus Nouatianum.'*

We do not possess the materials for a complete life of Novatian; but that which we know about the man may help towards a clearer understanding of the style and the vicissitudes of his literary remains. It is not necessary to discuss the truth of the statement of Philostorgius[1] that he was by birth a Phrygian, although he drew some of his followers from that fanatical race and shared some of its characteristics. According to a letter of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, at one time he was 'possessed' for a considerable period and had to call in the exorcists of the Church of Rome, where he resided; and falling into a grievous sickness, had received clinical baptism, but on his recovery had failed to receive the seal of confirmation from the Bishop[2]. Nevertheless the Bishop (Fabian or one of his predecessors) advanced him to the order of the presbyterate, doubtless owing to his

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* viii 15. So the schismatic Montanus was a native of the neighbouring Mysia.

[2] *apud* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi 43.

great intellectual gifts, in spite of the expressed disapproval of the clergy and many of the laity[1].

From Cyprian we learn that Novatian had been a follower of the Stoic philosophy; and we may trace its influence in his partiality for the syllogism in argument, as well as in his cosmogony (cf. *de Trinitate* c. iii with notes; and *de Spectaculis* ix, if Novatian's). It is certain that by the year A.D. 250 his abilities had gained him a commanding position among the forty-six Roman presbyters. It was in that year, when the martyrdom of Fabian created a vacancy in the Roman see, that we find a couple of letters[2] addressed by Novatian on behalf of the Roman clergy to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, asking his counsel upon the vexed question of the treatment of the 'lapsed,' i.e. those who under stress of the Decian persecution had sacrificed. In both letters there is an austerity of tone in regard to these offenders, not wholly unmerited in view of their peremptory demand for indulgence[3]. The writer is none the less ready to 'remit the case to the bishop,' as soon as a successor to Fabian should be found, and meanwhile to confer with bishops, priests, deacons, confessors and faithful laity elsewhere upon this question[4]. But perhaps some words at the opening of

[1] *apud* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi 43 κατηξιώθη τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου κατὰ χάριν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

[2] Letters xxx and xxxvi in Cypr. *Epistolae*: in Migne, *Patrol.* iv, col. 315 (numbered xxxi), also *ib.* iii, col. 993, and *ib.* iv, col. 311 (numbered xxx). The evidence for the authorship of xxxvi is not quite as strong as that of xxx, for which Cyprian vouches (*Ep.* lv 5).

[3] *Ep.* xxx 7 'qui petitur flecti debet non incitari': *Ep.* xxxvi 1 'lapsorum fratrum immoderata petulantia usque ad periculosam uerborum temeritatem producta'; *ib.* 3 'neque sine instinctu quorundam ausuros fuisse omnes tam petulanter sibi pacem uindicare.' Cp. *Ep.* xxiii (Migne xxii) 3.

[4] xxxvi 2 *sub fin.*, xxx 6, 7 *sub fin.*

letter xxx are ominous: 'he who has a clear conscience, resting on the vigour[1] of evangelical discipline, who is his own true witness in the court of heaven, is wont to be content with the judgment of God alone.' Novatian had evidently prejudged the question, as one that involved not merely the discipline, but the healthy 'vigour' of the Church: and upon the election of Cornelius to the vacant see of Rome[2] he placed himself at the head of the party of rigorists who held that the lapsed, while they might be exhorted to repentance, were to be excluded from Church communion for ever[3]. Then followed the fatal step of his life. He procured three bishops, simple and ignorant men (ἀνθρώπους ἀγροίκους καὶ ἁπλουστάτους) from a remote part of Italy, to consecrate him bishop in rivalry to Cornelius[4]: after which he bound his adherents by oath upon the Consecrated Elements not to desert him for Cornelius. In the autumn of the year 251 he was excommunicated by a council of sixty bishops held at Rome; but the Novatianist schism, to which the name of Καθαροί or 'Puritans' was afterwards given, spread as far as Spain in the west and Syria in the east, and is found in existence as late as the sixth century.

Of the later career of Novatian little or nothing is known. From ch. i of his *de Cibis Iudaicis* it appears that for a time he was separated by circumstances from his Roman adherents. There is a story, but again it

[1] A very characteristic word in Novatian, as also in Cyprian.

[2] March 5, 251: Tixeront, *Hist. des Dogmes*, p. 378.

[3] Bardenhewer, *Geschichte d. altkirchlichen Litteratur*, Freib. in Breisg. 1903, ii 561 refers to Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* iv 28, Cypr. *Ep.* 55. 27: 57. 4.

[4] We can hardly credit the statement of Cornelius that they performed the act in a drunken condition, under compulsion, at the tenth hour: a legend of the order of the 'Nag's Head' fable. (Ref. to Euseb. vi 43. 8—9.)

rests on the testimony of his rival, that in time of persecution he went into retirement, and when implored by the deacons to bring comfort to his suffering brethren, replied that he wished to be a presbyter no longer and was a lover of a different philosophy[1]. Possibly he was more zealous in theological study than in the fulfilment of the pastoral office. Socrates has a tradition that he suffered as a martyr in the persecution of Valerian (after A.D. 257).

Novatian is not the only instance which Church history furnishes of a man of undoubted spirituality and high intellectual endowments, in whom some one austere or even morbid conviction, gaining impetus from an autocratic temper, has overborne the larger principles of charity and Catholicity[2]. We may regret that Cornelius could characterise a learned fellow-Christian as a 'cunning and malignant creature.' But when the same writer refers to him ironically in the same letter as 'this marvellous man,' 'the brilliant,' 'the dogmatist,' 'the champion of ecclesiastical science,' 'the vindicator of the Gospel[3],' he preserves for us, unintentionally, the encomiums which the admirers of the schismatic lavished upon him. The rare culture and eloquence of Novatian could not be denied, but it was easy to accuse him of being a 'better philosopher than Christian[4],'

[1] Cornel. *ap.* Euseb. l.c.

[2] 'nec fraternam caritatem nec ecclesiasticam unitatem tenuit' (Cypr. *ad Anton.* in Migne iii, col. 815).

[3] Cornel. *ad Fab. Antioch.* α′ (Migne iii 761) *τῷ δολερῷ καὶ κακοήθει θηρίῳ. Ib. passim* ὁ θαυμάσιος οὗτος, ὁ λαμπρότατος, ὁ δογματιστής, ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἐπιστήμης ὑπερασπιστής, ὁ ἐκδικητὴς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

[4] 'quisquis ille est et qualiscumque est, Christianus non est qui in Christi ecclesia non est. Iactet se licet et philosophiam vel eloquentiam suam superbis uocibus praedicet,' etc. (Cypr. *ad Anton.*, Migne iii 815): 'inter Christianos et philosophos plurimum distat' (*ib.* col. 807): 'in perniciem fratrum lingua sua perstrepens, et facundiae uenenatae iacula contorquens,

and his scholarship would have commanded more respect at Alexandria than it could at Rome and Carthage. Moreover, Roman Stoicism, even as we have it in Seneca, with whom Weyman[1] finds in our writer points of affinity, lacked the breadth of humanism: it is more akin to the spirit of Calvin than to that of Erasmus.

The Novatianist schism was a revolt against the discipline, not against the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Whatever may be thought of the conformability of certain statements in the *de Trinitate* to the Nicene standard, neither this nor any other of Novatian's works was disallowed on account of heterodoxy. In fact these treatises have been preserved solely on their intrinsic merits. But the writer has paid the price of secession: a heavier price indeed than his more eminent precursor, a man of a kindred spirit, Tertullian. Such of his writings as survived, survived only under cover of some other name; they are to be sought among the supposititious works of Tertullian, Cyprian or Origen. In the same way, in the fifth century some writings of Apollinarius were 'disseminated under the famous names of Athanasius, Julius, and Gregory Thaumaturgus[2].' The history of the *de Trinitate*, as related in pages xxiii, xxiv, provides the best example of this survival under a disguise; and in the same way, the pastoral letter known as *de Cibis Iudaicis* was bound up with the works of Tertullian. We know that Novatian was a prolific writer. Jerome mentions the following works of his, in addition to the above-named: *de Pascha*, *de Sabbato*, *de Circumcisione*, *de Sacerdote*, *de Oratione*, *de Instantia* ('of perseverance under trial'), *de Attalo*[3]. He also

magis durus saecularis philosophiae prauitate quam sophiae dominicae lenitate pacificus' (Cypr. *Ep.* lx 3, Migne iii 860).

[1] Landgraf u. Weyman, *Novat. de Cib. Iud.* p. 225.

[2] Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 153.

[3] Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* c. 70: adding 'multaque alia.'

speaks of a collection of Letters[1]. Of these two only are extant, the letters addressed on behalf of the Roman clergy to St Cyprian and preserved among his Epistles[2]. They form an important contribution to our general impressions of the style characteristic of this writer, and illustrate his attitude on questions disciplinary and doctrinal.

For Novatian stands out among the Christian writers of the Western Church as the earliest Latin stylist. For a long time Greek was the official language of the Churches of the west, the Roman Church not excepted. It was the signal service of Tertullian to the Western Church that he provided her with a Latin terminology of doctrine, much as Cicero long before had created the philosophical terminology of the language. But the style of Tertullian was the replica of the man: strong, harsh, knotty, often disjointed, only sometimes settling down into a passionate current of eloquence. Novatian had studied the African father to good purpose, as even the extant titles of his works shew; but he brought to the task of theological exposition something which was his own, a facile pen which had been trained to its purpose by the study of great classical masters, in particular of Virgil.

As far as I know, there was no one in the third century worthy to be named with him in this respect. Thus in the analysis of his style, rhythm and diction, we have a touchstone which can be applied, with the hope of a constructive certainty, to other works which have hitherto been placed among the writings genuine or apocryphal of some Catholic father. And thus this long-lost author may be restored—*inuenias etiam disiecti membra poetae*—though perhaps with varying degrees of

[1] Hier. *Ep.* x *ad Paul.* c. 3. [2] *v. supra*, p. xiv.

certitude. There are five treatises included among the works of Cyprian which some leading scholars now attribute to Novatian: the *de Spectaculis*, *de Bono Pudicitiae*, *de Idolorum Vanitate*, *aduersus Iudaeos*, and *de Laude Martyrii*. Space forbids me to enter into the question here; but I should consider the authorship of Novatian proved for the *de Laude Martyrii*, which (as Harnack says) was enough to establish the writer's fame as an orator[1], just as the *de Trinitate* establishes his fame as a theologian; and proved also for the *de Spectaculis*. The former is a letter to martyrs in prison, the latter the letter of a bishop from his place of exile to his adherents. In the two treatises (the *de Laude Martyrii* and *de Spectaculis*) we find the writer's old partiality for elaborate metaphor[2], his use of hyperbaton[3], of rhetorical formulas of transition and qualification[4]; and some of his characteristic words[5].

His fine effects are often secured by the use of

[1] It must be admitted that for this very reason the *de Laude Martyrii* falls below the theological level of the writer's best work: there is too apparent a straining after effect.

[2] E.g. from wounds, *de Spect.* i 'sanitatis obductae cicatricem,' *Ep.* xxxvi 3, *Ep.* xxx 3 'obducere cicatricem': from the sea and its shores, *de Laud. Martyr.* iv, comparing *de Trin.* i, p. 3, ll. 2—7.

[3] E.g. *de Trin.* v 'ad *humanorum* relata esse exempla uitiorum': *de Laud. Martyr.* xxi '*unius* cuncta sunt temporis, unius poma feruntur aestatis': *de Spect.* v 'si perrogem *quo* ad illud spectaculum itinere peruenerit.'

[4] E.g. *de Spect.* ii 'hoc in loco non immerito dixerim' vi 'ut de hoc scenae inquinamento...transitum faciam': *Cib. Iud.* ii 'ut ab exordio... incipiam': *Laud. Martyr.* xiv 'atque ut transeam cuncta': *de Trin.* xxi *init.*, xxii *init.*: 'ut ita dixerim,' *de Trin.* vi, p. 19, l. 10 note.

[5] E.g. 'cumulus' 'crown of completion,' *Ep.* xxx 6, *Laud. Martyr.* iv, xi: 'praesto,' *de Trin.* xxiv, p. 89. 3, *Laud. Martyr.* vi, *de Spect.* i: 'expedio,' *de Trin.* xxiv, p. 90. 3, *Laud. Martyr.* iv, *de spect.* vi: 'robur, robustus,' *Laud. Martyr.* viii, xvii, *Cib. Iud.* iii: 'uigeo, uigor,' *de Trin.* viii, p. 27. 3, *de Spect.* i, *Ep.* xxx *init.*, *Ep.* xxxvi *init.*: substantives in '-mentum' *passim*.

anaphora for the balancing of clauses. See the following passages, *de Trinitate* ii, p. 9, ll. 5—14, x, p. 31, 10 sq. xxix, last sentence: *ep.* xxxvi 3: *de Laud. Martyr.* iv *ad init.*, vi *ad init.*: *Cib. Iud.* i, second sentence, and the fine satirical passage in *de Spect.* v on those who could tell a horse's pedigree for generations ('memoriter totam equini generis subolem computantes'), but were ignorant of the Gospel story. Other features are his command of Virgilian diction[1], and of classical prose rhythm[2] especially noticeable in the *clausulae* of his paragraphs. A test of a different kind is to be found in a study of the quotations, which conform to the type represented by the Old Latin versions (based on the Septuagint), rather than to the Hebrew text as it was afterwards rendered in the Vulgate[3].

Of the other treatises, the *de Bono Pudicitiae*, an anonymous episcopal letter, exhibits the best features of Novatian's style, antithetic force, varied diction and rhythm, and some play of fancy: while its austere moral tone is what we should expect from the leader

[1] Most noticeable in *Laud. Martyr.* cc. vii, xvi, xx, xxi, xxiii. Even *Cib. Iud.* has such Virgilianisms as 'arborum fetus' (v. *Georg.* i 55). In the *de Trinitate* we find 'tantae molis,' c. i, p. 6. 7 (cp. *Aen.* i 33) and other instances which are noted in Index III. Harnack ('Eine bisher nicht erkannte Schrift Novatian's v. Jahre 249—250') pp. 26—33 gives copious reff. to *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, although, in the opinion of Ammundsen, *Novatianus og Novatianismen*, p. 27 note, he overstrains his point.

[2] The reference is to Zielinski's canon of the *clausula* or close of the 'period' in the classical writers, the best type being –⏑– | –⏑ or the same resolved: *v. Classical Review*, vol. xix, p. 164 (Mr A. C. Clark). The *Laud. Martyr.* constantly conforms to this.

[3] Cp. *de Trin.* iii, p. 10, l. 6 n. There is no doubt that there were more than two Old Latin versions: cp. *Studia Biblica* (Oxford) i on the 'Corbey St James.' The oldest may have been an *Afra*, or Latin version for the African Church, Greek having long remained the speech of the Roman Christians. Aug. *de Doctr. Chr.* ii 15 'in ipsis interpretationibus Itala ceteris praeferatur, nam est uerborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae.' Schanz, *Gesch. Röm. Litt.* iii, § 772.

of a 'Puritan' secession. The *de Idolorum Vanitate*, with its varied antiquarian learning and its exposition of the 'monarchia' of God and the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy in the Coming of Christ, has an even stronger claim to be included in the Opera Novatiana from its close contact with the *de Trinitate*. How could the writer's view be more aptly summarised than in the words, 'hic deus noster, hic Christus est, qui mediator duorum hominem induit quem perducat ad patrem: quod homo est esse Christus uoluit, ut et homo possit esse quod Christus est'? (*Idol. Van.* xi). The tract or sermon *aduersus Iudaeos* is also attributed to Novatian, 'by Harnack with certainty, by Landgraf with reserve[1].' The internal evidence is slight.

Another of the *spuria* of Cyprian which has been attributed to Novatian is the treatise *de Singularitate Clericorum*, its theme being 'ne clerici cum feminis commorentur.' In spite of the resemblances in diction, in the text of its quotations, and in rigorist temper to the work of Novatian, it cannot yet be said that anything more has been demonstrated than that this treatise is coloured by the influence of Novatian[2].

But the discovery by the well-known patristic scholar, M. Pierre Batiffol, of twenty homilies, entitled in the MSS *Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum*, which he published in the year 1900, has given rise to an animated discussion in German and English reviews. Batiffol supposes that Origen was the author of a Greek original, translated by Victorinus of Pettau. Weyman and others maintain that the Latin is original, and the work of Novatian. This theory is maintained with much

[1] Herm. Jordan, *d. Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians*, Leipz. 1902, p. 68.

[2] F. v. Blacha, *de Sing. Cleric.* Breslau, 1904.

skill by H. Jordan in a monograph of the year 1902[1]. The whole question is lucidly treated by Bardenhewer[2], to whom we must refer our readers. Suffice it to say that while the originality of the Latin is established conclusively, we are confronted by a serious difficulty when we attempt to prove Novatian's authorship. The Trinitarian formulas of the *Tractatus* indicate a later stage in doctrinal development than that of the *de Trinitate*; they are sometimes Nicene or post-Nicene in character[3]. The advocates of an identity of authorship for the two works must of necessity assume for the *Tractatus* a touching up by a later hand. The hypothesis of Weyman and Jordan remains at present unproved: if it is ever to be established, it can only be by a very close textual study of the manuscripts in order to find traces of an 'altera manus.'

§ 2. *The literary history of the treatise* de Trinitate, *its date and arrangement.*

i. St Jerome is our earliest authority for the existence of this treatise among the works of Novatian; a list of which he gives, closing thus: 'et *de Trinitate* grande volumen quasi ἐπιτομήν operis Tertulliani, quod plerique nescientes Cypriani existimant[4].' Again, he controverts an assertion of Rufinus, that the Macedonian

[1] H. Jordan, *op. cit.*

[2] O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte d. altkirchlich. Literatur*, vol. ii 568—574.

[3] Bardenhewer quotes 'deus uerus de deo uero, unigenitus ab ingenito' (*Tract.* 3). 'Christum uerum deum et uerum dei filium unigenitum de ingenito natum' (*Tract.* 20). 'Nemo enim uincit nisi qui patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum aequali potestate et indifferenti uirtute crediderit' (*Tract.* 14). Cf. Jordan, *Theol....Novatians*, pp. 52, 53, on the relation of *Tract.* 3 and *de Trin.* c. 18.

[4] Hieron. (*de Vir. Ill.* c. 70) *opp.* i (Migne) col. 453.

heretics, 'who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit,' had hawked the *Libellus de Trinitate* of Tertullian about the streets of Constantinople at a small price, having incorporated it with the *Epistles* of Cyprian, whose authority they wished to claim for their heresy. Jerome pronounces this a twofold falsehood, saying that the work is neither Cyprian's nor Tertullian's but Novatian's, 'cuius et inscribitur titulo et auctoris eloquium styli proprietas demonstrat[1].'

Some perplexity has been created by Jerome's description of the work as an epitome of a work of Tertullian's. There is nothing in the writings of the latter except the *aduersus Praxean* which can come into consideration: he has left no treatise *de Trinitate*. And our treatise is distinctly longer than the *adu. Praxean*, and also contains some thoughts which remind us rather of Irenaeus than of Tertullian[2].

The theory proposed by Mr J. Quarry that the *de Trinitate* is a translation from a lost Greek original, probably the work of Hippolytus against Artemon, finds no supporters[3]. It is amazing to find that scholar speaking of 'the very barbarous air of the work as a Latin composition.' As a writer Novatian can hold his own with Tertullian or Cyprian; enough has been said already[4] of the independent merits of his style, as it may be judged from his acknowledged writings.

The preservation of the treatise, after the writer's schismatic action had discredited him in the eyes of

[1] Ruf. *de Adult. Libr. Orig.* 2: Hieron. *lib.* ii *c. Rufin.* § 19.

[2] E.g. the application of Hab. iii 3 in Iren. (Harvey) iv 55. 2 and *de Trin.* xii, p. 41: of Deut. xxviii 66 in Iren. v 18. 2 and *de Trin.* ix, p. 29. See also Introd. pp. xxvi n. 4, lvi.

[3] *Hermathena*, no. xxiii, Trin. Coll., Dublin, 1897. Anticipated in effect by Hagemann, *röm. Kirche u. i. Einfluss*, 1864.

[4] Introd., p. xviii foll.

posterity, was due to the happy accident which connected it (as Jerome's allusion shews) with the works of Tertullian[1]. Under that illustrious name it survived; and although no extant MS of Tertullian contains it[2], it was printed in early editions of that father, the first being that of J. Gangneius, Paris, 1545, who (according to Pamelius, a later editor) based his text on a MS in the possession of Politianus. This edition of Gangneius does not appear to have had a separate existence of its own, but to have formed part of the 1545 edition of B. Rhenanus' Tertullian (Guillard, Paris), which is to be found in the British Museum. In this—not on the title page, but in the middle of his 'catalogus operum Tertulliani'—Rhenanus says that this treatise, along with others, are here published for the first time, by the good offices of Gangneius[3].

The next edition is that of Sigismund Gelenius, published by Froben at Basel in 1550[4], which professes to rely largely on a MS formerly belonging to an English monastery which Gelenius calls 'coenobium Masburense,' lent to him by John Leland the antiquary[5]:

[1] Similarly the *de Cibis Iudaicis* connects with Tertull. *de Mundis atque Immundis Animalibus*.

[2] The *de Cib. Iudaicis* exists in one MS in the Imperial Library at Petersburg, under the title of Tertullian.

[3] After the twenty-two titles of Tertullian's known writings we read as follows:—'Haec vero sequentia opuscula nunc primum eduntur in lucem beneficio Joannis Gangneii Parisini theologi et Christianissimi Galliarum regis primi eleemosynarii: ex vetustissimo cod. desumpta.'

[4] 'Q. Sept. Flor. Tertull. ad complures veteres e Gallicanis Germanisque bibliothecis conquisitos recognita codd. in quibus praecipuus fuit unus longe incorruptissimus in ultimam usque petitus Britanniam.'

[5] Who acc. to Pref. of Gelenius' ed. of 1562, 'communicavit exemplar in Masburensi coenobio gentis eius vetustissimo repertum.' [Dugdale's index of Monastic houses knows none so named: a friend suggests 'Malvurensi,' 'of Malvern.' Malmesbury is also suggested.] See Lupton's edition of Tertullian *de Baptismo*, p. xxxvi.

but unfortunately Gelenius does not particularise the readings of that MS. I have examined this edition carefully and noted its important readings.

The next editor, Jacob Pamelius of Bruges, who published an edition of Tertullian (first edition, Antwerp, 1579), was the first to issue the *de Trinitate* (and the *de Cib. Iudaicis*) under the name of Novatian, and to divide it into chapters. He expresses his obligation to another ancient British MS, citing its readings in his notes, and describing it as 'Anglicum MS exemplar Dn. Joannis Clementis.' In the absence of all manuscript evidence, these citations afford valuable evidence for the text of the treatise[1].

Oxford has the honour of having produced the first separate edition of the *de Trinitate*, with notes by Edward Welchman, in the year 1724. This was quickly followed by the edition of John Jackson (London, 1728), which exhibits a stronger theological grasp and greater critical power. Up to the present time Jackson has spoken the last word; for the Venice edition of the fathers by Gallandi (1767) follows his text, and is in its turn followed by Migne (*Patrologiae Latinae* tom. iii 861—970).

It is difficult to see how any substantial improvement can be made in the text, until some fortunate scholar lights upon a manuscript of merit. We may think that we trace (especially in the last chapter) the hand of the theological *redacteur*, who prefers an orthodox to a pure text; nor is it wonderful that this has happened, when we find Arnobius the younger roundly quoting its

[1] The British MSS aforesaid have vanished without trace. I was informed by Prof. Dr Binz, librarian of the Universitäts-Bibliothek at Basel, that in the 16th cent. the MSS after passing through the Froben press were not uncommonly handed over to the printers, as being of no further use.

phrases as Arian[1]. But in such a case all emendation must remain conjectural.

ii. As regards the date of the *de Trinitate*, Dr Harnack supports the view which has approved itself to most writers, that it was written before Novatian's lapse into schism, which occurred in A.D. 251. The reference to Sabellius[2], who was a disciple of Noetus, would indicate a date somewhere about A.D. 250; while the work must be placed after the date of Tertullian's *adu. Praxean*, which Bardenhewer gives as 217 or 213[3]. The view of Hagemann (*Röm. Kirche*, p. 401), that it was a controversial tract written in support of Hippolytus in his dispute with the Roman Church, is purely conjectural.

iii. The treatise falls into four main divisions. The first three answer to the Roman Creed, which may be reconstructed in part, as Novatian knew it, from the opening words of these divisions, somewhat as follows:

'Credo in Deum [unum] Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem [rerum omnium conditorem]: et in Filium Dei, Christum Iesum, Dominum Deum nostrum: credo etiam in Spiritum Sanctum [ecclesiae repromissum].'

The words printed in brackets seem to the present writer to have had, in all probability, a place in Novatian's *Regula ueritatis*[4], although not so considered by Dr Swete (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 108, 'Rule of Faith acc. to Nov.') or (for the most part) by Dr Burn (*Introduction to the Creed*, p. 46); they are found in substance in

[1] In the Dialogue with Serapion: Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'église* i 307. We know that Gangneius took a liberty with the text: n. on xvi, p. 55, l. 11.

[2] *de Trin.* c. xii: cp. n. in Robertson, *History of the Church* i, p. 159.

[3] *Altkirchl. Lit.* ii, p. 368.

[4] For this term see Irenaeus, *adu. Haer.* i 1. 20, with Harvey's note, and *ib.* i 15.

Tertullian (*Virg. Vel.* i, *adu. Prax.* i 16, ap. Swete, p. 107), and in *paraphrase* in our text[1].

In view of the important issues at stake, any evidence for the original form of the Roman Symbol is to be welcomed. Harnack holds that it was based upon 'the baptismal formula and confessional formulas of a summarising character...including Eastern formulas,' and originated about the middle of the second century. But there are valid grounds for believing that it had its prototypes also in the East, baptismal (and Trinitarian) confessions. Harnack will not admit their existence, and yet there is evidence for them which cannot be hastily rejected: notably, the κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας associated by Irenaeus with baptism[2], and the περὶ πίστεως γραφή ('received from the bishops before us') laid by Eusebius of Caesarea before the Council of Nicaea in 325.

The first section of the *de Trinitate* relates to God the Father (chs. i—viii); the second to God the Son (chs. ix—xxviii); the third section to God the Holy Ghost (ch. xxix). The last two chapters (xxx, xxxi) form a complementary section, setting forth the unity of the Godhead especially as against Adoptianist and against Patripassian heretics (of the school of Sabellius).

[1] Reasons are given for accepting 'unum' in n. on c. ix, p. 28. 6. The whole question of the presence of this word 'One' in the original Roman Creed is a difficult one: Zahn supposes it was introduced on anti-Gnostic grounds and afterwards omitted to counteract Monarchian teaching; and Burn takes a similar view, holding also that Tertullian's Creed probably contained 'unum,' but that in that of Novatian it is missing (*op. cit.* p. 58). Loofs (*Symbolik* i 6. 3) cannot decide: Harnack denies its presence in R (*Apostles' Creed*, Eng. tr. p. 72); and doubtless its presence there would strengthen the position of those who trace R back to Eastern (perhaps Johannine) sources.

[2] Consult Loofs, *Symbolik* i, § 5, on Oriental Baptismal Symbols of the Ante-Nicene period.

Though the treatise now bears on its title-page the theological term 'Trinity,' this term occurs nowhere in the text, as though the writer had intentionally avoided it; for the word 'Trinitas' (Τριάς) occurs in Theophilus of Antioch, Hippolytus, and Tertullian.

The distribution of the subject over the chapters indicates of itself that the predominant question for the writer is the relation of our Lord to the Father as it is conditioned by the Incarnation, and the union in Him of the two natures. The doctrine of the Holy Ghost is so slightly handled, that certain heretics claimed the treatise in support of their own views[1]. Unquestionably Novatian never speaks of Him as 'tertia persona' or even as 'deus': he is content with the designations 'spiritus sanctus,' 'paraclitus,' 'spiritus ueritatis,' and in one place (c. xxix, p. 110, 11), 'spiritus dei.' But the writer so enlarges on the operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul and in the Church, as to leave no doubt that he, no less than Tertullian, held the doctrine of His Personality[2].

A strange dislocation of pages occurred in the archetype MS of our ancient copies of this Treatise: by which the section beginning 'ex quo manus' (end of ch. xix, page 73, first line) and ending with 'sed filium comprobasse' (the last words of ch. xxvii, page 100, second line) was transposed so as to follow the words towards the end of chapter xiv 'illuc redit ubi prius fuit' (page 47, line 28). Thus the old editions (such as that of Pamelius) begin their ch. xxiii with 'quod si de caelo,' and thus to the end of the Treatise. Subjoined is a comparative table of chapters in the old editions, and in Welchman's (who restored the right order):

[1] c. xvi, p. 55, l. 11 n. and above, § 2 i.
[2] Harnack, *D.G.* i³, p. 537 n.

Old editions.	Modern editions.
xxiii	xiv *fin.* xv
xxiv	xvi
xxv	xvii
xxvi	xviii
xxvii	xix to *esset Christus*
xv	xix *fin.* xx
xvi	xxi
xvii	xxii

and so to the end.

§ 3. *The subordination of the Son.*

The Christology of Novatian is based on that of Tertullian. It cannot be questioned that the Church had not yet attained to the view of the Person of Christ which belongs to the developed creed of post-Nicene theology. Her dogmatic system was in process and flux; and the phenomenon will, probably to the end of time, affect students variously. One man will see in it the growth of the mythus, or at least of human opinions fated to 'have their day and cease to be.' Another will see in it the progressive revelation of Divine truths to the Church as she is able to apprehend them. On either view, if it should be possible to isolate a particular doctrine and examine it at one stage of its development, the gain will be clear.

We have first to glance at the problem presented to the Catholic thinker in the earlier half of the third century. The age of Apologetics, addressed to the Pagan or Jewish enemy of the faith, was past; it was to the more insidious approaches of the heretics that the growth of a system of theology (as distinct from the Apostolic κήρυγμα and the primitive σύμβολον) was due. At first it had been enough to know Jesus Christ

as 'the Lord,' 'the Son of God,' 'our Saviour,' 'the Master,' and to await His speedy return in glory. The Gnostic heresies, which threatened the adulteration of Christianity with a fantastic philosophy, compelled Christian thinkers to find some more satisfying formula; or rather, sent them back to the New Testament to find the elements of such a formula in the Johannine doctrine of the Logos. The like may be said of the Catholic reply to the Ebionite teaching, which reduced our Lord to the place of a second Moses. At the beginning of the third century two tendencies of thought were apparent: the Humanitarian view of Christ, which is represented by the 'rationalistic Monarchians' (better named 'Adoptianists,' as holding that Jesus Christ was merely the adopted Son of the Father[1], who received Divine δύναμις at His baptism); and the view of the Modalist Monarchians, of whom Sabellius was the best-known representative. As against the former, it was necessary to establish His equality with the Father[2]. As against the latter, with whom the Patripassians[3] are to be classed, it was necessary to establish the distinction of Persons in the Trinity. This could not be done without a careful

[1] Harnack, *D.G.* i[3], p. 182. Schaff, *Ante-Nicene Christianity* ii, p. 572 sq. Theodotus and Artemon were the chief exponents of this heresy, cp. Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*[4], c. viii, § 1.

[2] I.e. that in Him εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (Col. i 19): in contrast with the Gnostic emanation theory. Cf. c. xxiii, p. 85, l. 6 n.

[3] The Patripassians denied the distinct Personality of the Son. Chief among them were Praxeas and Noetus, both favoured by the Popes of their day, Victor and Callistus. Praxeas taught that the Father became man and suffered in Jesus Christ: 'ipsum patrem descendisse in uirginem, ipsum ex ea natum, ipsum passum, denique ipsum esse Iesum Christum' (Tertull. *adu. Praxean* i). The Patripassians may be called 'modalistic Monarchians': i.e. they insisted on the Unity of the Godhead to this extent, that they represented the Trinity as denoting three 'modes' of manifestation, not Three Persons in the Godhead. We have a further development in the teaching of Sabellius.

study of the question 'cur Deus homo?'; and a study of the Incarnation furnished a much-needed correction to the pantheistic tenets of Valentinus and his followers, and to the docetic views of Marcion.

We cannot here do more than indicate the salient points in Tertullian's Christology. The Son of God, the Word, is not a mere attribute of the Father, such as His wisdom or power; His generation is before the creation of the world. His Sonship is threefold: the Word eternally in God[1]; the Second Person coming forth in the act of creation; the Son become Man, a visible Personality over against God[2]. A docetic Christ could not have atoned for our sins, and the 'oeconomia' of salvation demands that the Son should act on earth in the Father's name[3]. Thus the Son is very Man, and is distinguished from the Father, though of one substance with Him and with the Spirit. Tertullian's favourite illustration is that of the sun and its light: 'even a ray of the sun considered by itself I call sun, but I do not therefore proceed to designate the sun, whose is the ray, Ray[4].' There is 'distinction' but not 'diversity[5].' He can even speak of the Son as a 'portio' of

[1] Tertull. *adu. Prax.* v 'ante omnia deus erat solus...solus autem, quia nihil aliud extrinsecus praeter illum. ceterum ne tunc quidem solus, habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso, rationem suam scilicet. quae ratio, sensus ipsius est. hanc Graeci λόγον dicunt.'

[2] Consult Dorner, *Doctrine of Person of Christ* (Eng. tr.) I ii pp. 58; 68, 69: and Tert. *adu. Prax.* xiv 'consequens erit ut inuisibilem patrem intellegamus pro plenitudine maiestatis, uisibilem uero filium agnoscamus pro modulo deriuationis': also *adu. Prax.* v, vi, vii *passim*: viii *init.* on the προβολή which, though a Valentinian term, he adopts.

[3] *adu. Marc.* iii 8 'sic nec passiones Christi eius fidem merebuntur: nihil enim passus est qui non uere est passus. uere autem pati phantasma non potuit. euersum est igitur totum dei opus.'

[4] *adu. Prax.* xiii.

[5] *ib.* ix.

Deity 'ex ipsius dei substantia et ut portio aliqua totius[1].'

Tertullian was the first to give full theological value to the Sonship of Christ, as distinct from the idea of the Logos, which taken by itself might have merged into the theosophic fancies of the age. He did much to define the distinction of Persons; but he failed to place the equality of the Son upon an absolute basis. He was satisfied to find the ground of the Trinitarian distinction in the Godhead in the fulfilment of the purpose of Creation and Redemption. The Valentinian spoke of the προβολαί of Aeons; and Tertullian, and Novatian too, expressed the relation of the Son to the Father in terms (such as *proferri*, *procedere*) which a later theological instinct has rejected[2]. And thus the subordination of the Son to the Father as the source of Deity is stated in terms which infringe upon His equality within the Godhead[3]. In one passage he seems even to deny His pre-existence 'fuit autem tempus, cum...Filius non fuit' (*adu. Hermog.* iii), but there it is the Name rather than the Person that is in question.

Novatian is heir to the Christology of Tertullian, and must be studied in connexion with his predecessor. His gifts are literary rather than philosophic: those of

[1] *adu. Prax.* xxvi: cp. ix 'pater tota substantia est, filius uero deriuatio totius et portio': *adu. Marc.* iii 6 'filius portio plenitudinis.' *v.* Dorner, *op. cit.* p. 78.

[2] These terms may have been suggested by the Stoic distinction between the Logos ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός, unspoken thought and thought expressed: *v.* c. xv, p. 50, ll. 12—20.

[3] Although Tertullian asserts His unity of substance. 'They are called Two, not as Gods nor as Lords, but *qua* Father and Son: and that not by separation of substance, but by disposition, when we pronounce the Son *indiuiduum et separatum a patre, nec statu sed gradu alium*': and below, 'One God, from the very fact that He is to be called God in virtue of His unity with the Father,' *adu. Prax.* xix.

popular exposition, of logical arrangement of ideas, and of Scriptural exegesis, but not that of metaphysical insight. His purpose is didactic and practical. And so we find that his Christology is no less subordinationist than Tertullian's, except in one particular: he allows room for the conception of an absolute and eternal distinction in the Godhead, when he allows that Divine relations are timeless[1]. It may be added that in ch. xviii he adapts Tertullian's figure of the sun and its rays for the purpose of a fine description of the gradual self-revelation of God's Image to man[2]. Still he can only maintain the unity of the Godhead by positing a 'procession' of the Son from the Father which is no less subordinationist than that of Tertullian.

There is nothing in the conception of the Son's subordination to conflict with the orthodoxy of a later time. Even such a theologian as Dr Liddon can write thus, referring to St John xiv 28 ὁ Πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστίν: 'Even if our Lord is here speaking...of His essential Deity, His words still express very exactly a truth which is recognised and required by the Catholic doctrine. The subordination of the Everlasting Son to the Everlasting Father is strictly compatible with the Son's absolute Divinity; it is abundantly implied in our Lord's language; and it is an integral element of the ancient doctrine which steadily represents the Father as Alone Unoriginate, the Fount of Deity in the Eternal Life of the Ever-blessed Trinity[3].' The utmost that need be said of Novatian's language is that

[1] *De Trin.* xxxi, p. 121, ll. 4, 5 'principium natiuitatis ante omne tempus accepit.'

[2] Contrast the crude language of Tertullian, e.g. in passages quoted *supra* n. 1, p. xxxii: and cp. *de Trin.* xxviii, p. 103, ll. 23 sq.

[3] Liddon, *B.L.*[8] p. 199: also Bp Westcott's masterly note on Jo. xiv 28.

it is sometimes unguarded. Generally, he describes the relationship of the Son to the Father by such terms as 'oboedientia,' 'subditus,' 'subiectus,' 'minister,' 'angelus' and 'minor patre[1].' The writer, in his desire to controvert the Sabellian confusion of Persons in the Godhead (according to which 'Filius Dei' and 'Deus Pater' were not equal, but identical), fails to emphasise their transcendental equality. And yet even the expression 'minor Patre' has the highest Authority, and may signify precedence not in essence but in personality[2].

It would be well if theologians had always remembered, in discussing the mysteries of the Divine Nature, that the terms and the logical processes, through which alone the subject can be presented, are human and *ipso facto* inadequate. In this question of the subordination of the Son to the Almighty Father who is the 'Fount of Deity[3],' the significant fact is that of *obedience*, the fulfilment of the Divine Will; and it is probable that the thought of inferiority, which man cannot but associate with that of service, is utterly alien from the thought of the Divine Mind. In the Divine Life there may be an interchange of energy of which the conditions are but dimly discernible to us through the hints of revelation. It has already been remarked that inferiority in the sense of posteriority *in time* does not enter into the writer's conception of the subordination of the Son. He exalts the Son far above all created existences. It may indeed

[1] c. xxvii, p. 99, ll. 13, 14, 'dum ergo accipit sanctificationem a patre, minor patre est': other reff. pp. 38, 15; 64, 16, 17; 81, 10—16; 96, 10 sq. and note, xxviii, p. 103, 25 n., xxxi *passim* esp. p. 117. 5—p. 118. 5.

[2] Harnack, like many others, credits Nov. with the doctrine that the Son when His work is finished will cease to exist independently, but there is nothing in c. xxxi (to which he refers) to justify this. Cp. n. on xxxi, p. 122, l. 12.

[3] πηγὴ θεότητος Origen.

be said that his teaching contains an antidote to some of our modern popular theology. The wide acceptance of the 'kenotic' doctrine, though this doctrine by no means implies humanitarian views, may encourage a tendency to forget the other side of the truth as to the Person of Christ. On the other hand, in regard to the worship of Christ, Novatian is no less cautious than the earliest Christians, whose prayers were almost always offered to the Father through the Son, and their worship to Jesus Christ in His whole Person, the Godhead in the Manhood[1].

It is the characteristic of Christians that they 'know the Father' (1 Jo. ii 14). In our Western indifference to the finer distinctions of doctrine we have fallen into a form of opinion, which sometimes can scarcely be distinguished from the Tritheism against which every pious Jewish Christian would have sternly protested[2], and which has lent itself to transactional theories of the Atonement. It is safest to keep the exact words of the New Testament on this matter before our minds. While Christ and the Father are One, He is the Only Way to the Father. And as Christ reveals unto men the Father, so the Spirit reveals unto men the things of Christ. In proportion as the Church assimilates that revelation, she is animated by the Living Spirit of Christ, and is herself 'the extension of the Incarnation' for the sake of the world and indeed of the whole universe.

[1] Liddon, *B.L.*[8] 378 sq. Walpole, *Vital Religion*, p. 62. Harnack, *D.G.* i[3], 174. *De Trin.* xiv, p. 46, 24 'in orationibus mediator inuocatur.' Cf. language of Greek Fathers προσκυνῶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ Συναμφότερον; e.g. Athan. on Jo. xx 28, and Jo. Damasc. *Orth. Fid.* iii 8.

[2] Cf. Dr Inge, *Personal Idealism*, pp. 36, 37 'this error has come about through the unfortunate use of the word "Person" with its misleading associations.'

§ 4. *The Pre-existence of the Son of God.*

A careful study of the system of Praxeas as far as we can gather it from Tertullian's treatise will shew that he denied the pre-existence of the Son, in holding that God the Father became incarnate in the Person of Christ[1], in other words, that before the Incarnation the Son had no existence[2]. Even the Catholic writers who controverted this Patripassian teaching base the Tri-personality of God on the claims of the work of redemption. The Trinity is in danger of becoming a mere 'oeconomy,' as in the systems controverted[3]. The eternal existence of the Logos in the Father is, in Tertullian, rather formal than real; for he can compare it with the existence of unuttered speech in a human mind, suggestive as an illustration, but not an adequate parallel. Again, his application of the words of Isaiah 'ego primus et in superuentura ego sum' in connexion with St John's 'in principio erat sermo,' is this: that the Word was begotten in the beginning ('in principio prolatus'), whereas the Father has no beginning ('initium'), as being begotten of none: and this 'beginning' of the Word Tertullian seems to connect in that passage with God's purpose of Creation. In fact in his desire to escape the charge of ditheism, he approximates to that Gnostic doctrine of Aeons, which at the beginning of the same chapter he combats[4].

[1] *adu. Prax.* i 'ipsum dicit patrem descendisse in uirginem, ipsum ex ea natum, ipsum passum, denique ipsum esse Iesum Christum': *ib.* ii 'post tempus pater natus et pater passus, ipse deus, dominus omnipotens, Iesus Christus praedicatur.' *v. de Trin.* c. xxvi.

[2] See Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi 33. 1: and Dorner *op. cit.* 1 ii 35.

[3] Cp. *supra*, p. xxxi.

[4] See *adu. Prax.* xix, together with vi 'ut primum deus uoluit ea, quae cum sophiae ratione et sermone disposuerat intra se, in substantias et species suas edere, ipsum primum protulit sermonem...ut per ipsum fierent uniuersa'; and with the close of xiii.

How far is this the case with Novatian? A study of the latter part of ch. xvi may serve to shew that his view is more in accordance with Catholic standards; thus the words 'sublata praedestinatione...in substantia fuit Christus ante mundi institutionem' conform entirely to the Nicene statement 'begotten of His Father before all worlds.' Again, His coexistence with the Father is conditioned by His generation before all time, as we read in ch. xxxi 'cum sit genitus a patre, semper est in patre. semper autem sic dico, ut non innatum sed natum probem. sed qui ante omne tempus est, semper in patre fuisse dicendus est.' A careful study of that chapter will reveal a certain distinction between the views of Novatian and Tertullian. Novatian does without doubt find the purpose of the Son's generation in the creation of the Universe. Thus we read: 'hic ergo quando pater uoluit, processit ex patre: et qui in patre fuit, quia ex patre fuit, cum patre postmodum fuit, quia ex patre processit, substantia scilicet illa diuina, cuius nomen est uerbum, per quod facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil' (p. 118, ll. 5—9). Similarly in c. xv (p. 50, 17), it is said of the Word, 'non otiose prolatum est.' But the writer is careful not to commit himself, as Tertullian seems to do, to the statement that the Son proceeded from the Father not only for the purpose of, but at the moment of Creation. He says rather: 'principium natiuitatis ante omne tempus accepit' (p. 121, l. 4); and twice in ch. xxxi asserts that the Son's 'birth' was 'quando pater uoluit' (pp. 116, l. 4, 118, l. 5). It is a 'procession from the Father' before all time. Beyond this assertion of an extra-temporal generation the writer does not take us. He does not definitely affirm an eternal generation of the Son 'qua filius dei.' It must be added, that the passages

already quoted suffice to shew that Novatian affirms the 'always' existence of the Word in the Father, *before* the generation of the Son: however hard it may be to reconcile such language with his disclaimer of temporal relations[1]. The *De Trinitate* indicates for us a fresh moment in the progress of Christian thought towards the great formula of Athanasius, the Λόγος ὁμοούσιος in which Sabellian modalism and Gnostic subordinationism alike found their corrective. From the first a true instinct led the Church to reject any view of the Incarnation which represented it as a transient theophany.

The pre-existence of the Eternal Word is a dogma for which the current Christology of Germany is content to find an explanation by reference to the Platonic philosophy of the Idea. Harnack, in a learned and exhaustive excursus on the subject[2], thinks he can trace its genesis from the convergence of Judaic and Hellenic lines of thought. On the one hand there are the Jewish speculations as to a 'pattern' of earthly existences, things and persons, 'laid up in heaven[3]'; on the other hand, the Platonic notion of *νοούμενα* and *φαινόμενα*, spiritual conceptions taking a fleshly veil which was their inadequate manifestation. The critic then avers that there is a difference of view as regards the Person of Jesus Christ between the New Testament writers, between Paul, the author of 'Hebrews,' of the Apocalypse, of 1 Peter, and the Fourth Evangelist; the last-named alone distinctly

[1] Ammundsen rightly explains the 'semper' as meaning 'before all time' rather than 'in eternity,' in view of such language as 'antecedat necesse est eum, qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit' (p. 117, l. 7 sq.), *Nov. og Novatianismen*, p. 35.

[2] *D.G.* i^3, 755—764. Refer also to *ib.* pp. 98, 99.

[3] Exod. xxv 40: Jerusalem, the Temple, the Law; the Patriarchs, Moses. There was a pre-existent Israel, a pre-existent Messiah, in the thought of God: Harnack, l.c. and i 98.

representing the pre-mundane Christ as θεὸς ὢν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Harnack takes 1 Pet. i 18 as a *locus classicus* for what he would consider the simpler and earlier expression of this belief; especially the words προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δέ κ.τ.λ., as parallel to the Rabbinical view of the Messiah, which 'hypostatized the essence and exalted it above space and time.'

It is interesting to observe that this view, which limits the concept of pre-existence to God's predestination, is precisely the view which Novatian rejects in favour of the fuller belief[1]; and it may justly be urged that the passage in question refers to the sacrificial work rather than to the Person of Christ[2], and that 1 Peter contains language which is, at the lowest, compatible with the fullest belief in Christ's Divinity[3].

Then again, Harnack denies that in the earliest Christian writings there is any distinction between the σάρξ and the πνεῦμα in Christ, for which he makes St Paul responsible, quoting Rom. i 3. This he regards as a Hellenizing transformation of the Jewish idea of the Messiah; which involves, by its distinction between the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (1 Cor. xv 45) and the σάρξ its inadequate veil, the postulate of a pre-existent Spirit who is Divine; and thus for the φανεροῦσθαι of the Idea St Paul substitutes its κενοῦσθαι or ταπεινοῦσθαι in assuming flesh[4]. Thus the Pauline Christology would be a recasting of the Hebraic notion of the Messiah in

[1] *v.* quotation from c. xvi *supra*.

[2] Cp. St Peter's words in Acts ii 23 τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκδοτον ἀνείλατε.

[3] ii 3, 4: iii 15: iv 11.

[4] And thus Greek Christians could summarise Pauline Christology as the so-called Clement does, *Ep. ad Corinth.* ii 9 5 Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ὁ σώσας ἡμᾶς, ὢν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα, ἐγένετο σὰρξ καὶ οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν.

the mould of Greek philosophic thought: the end determines the beginning; the δι' ὅν involves the ἐξ οὗ or in other words the idea of Christ as the ἀρχὴ πάσης κτίσεως (Apoc. iii 14); and we are carried from soteriology into the sphere of cosmology. But it is otherwise in the Johannine writings: in which 'apart from the Prologue, a separation of πνεῦμα (λόγος) and σάρξ in Christ is not presupposed: it is always the whole Personality to whom everything exalted applies[1].' For, as Harnack conceives, this Hellenizing of Christian dogma was arrested in Church teaching by the influence of the Monarchians, of Athanasius, and of Biblical passages which pointed in another direction.

Against this theory of the evolution of the dogma of the pre-existence of the Second Person it may be urged: (*a*) That, except in the Johannine Prologue and St Paul's speeches at Athens and at Lystra, there is very little indeed in N.T. theology which suggests the 'acute Hellenisation' on which such stress is laid by Harnack. We might expect it in the Pauline Epistles, but we do not find it, whereas we do find expressions which remind us of Tertullian's 'quid simile philosophus et Christianus?'[2] (*b*) It cannot be said that the N.T. contains a single theological treatise. The words of Harnack, just quoted, on the Johannine idea of 'the Whole Christ,' may be set against his treatment of the historical Person of Jesus. We must not expect to find a reasoned system and a clear-cut terminology in the N.T., any more than we can expect to find grammar before language and logic before thought. Men wrote

[1] And therefore, according to Harnack, 'for the original readers, if they were educated Greeks, the Prologue must have been more intelligible' than the succeeding narrative.

[2] *Apol.* xlvi.

out of the fulness of an inspired experience, individual and yet gained in the community[1]. (*c*) At the same time we dare not hastily abandon the underlying postulates of the Christian faith, which were established beyond further dispute by the controversies of an age rich in subtle intellects to whose gift for metaphysical speculation the Western mind of to-day rarely attains. And to those who believe in the Divine guidance of the Church such an abandonment is not open. (*d*) We must always distinguish between first principles and deductions. In the case of the latter, human imperfection must qualify the effort to express Divine mysteries in human language[2]. For example, we may take the application of the word 'Son' to the Pre-incarnate. 'The only passage in the N.T. which goes wholly and obviously behind the fact of Incarnation drops altogether the words Father and Son[3],' from which the thoughts of priority and subordination are inseparable. Hence Marcellus of Ancyra, prominent in the refutation of Arius, held that the Logos is only called Son as a result of the Incarnation. But Marcellus went too far in thereby denying the *personal* pre-existence of the Logos. The fact is, that we cannot understand much about the eternal relations within the Being of Deity. It is in the light of the Incarnation as the supreme Theophany that the Christian student must think of the

[1] Cp. Bp Gore, *B.L.* (1891) p. 131 'it is important to notice that there is no moment when Jesus Christ expressly reveals this doctrine [the Trinity]. *It was overheard rather than heard.*'

[2] Cf. n. on 'Person,' p. lxii.

[3] Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, p. 214. Cf. words of Marcellus quoted *ib.* 211 from Euseb. *Eccl. Theol.* I xviii, p. 864 εἴτε γὰρ Ἰησοῦ, εἴτε Χριστοῦ ὀνόματος μνημονεύοι ἡ θεία γραφή, τὸν μετὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνου ὄντα σαρκὸς τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγον ὀνομάζειν φαίνεται. εἰ δέ τις καὶ πρὸ τῆς Νέας Διαθήκης τοῦ Χριστοῦ [ἢ τοῦ] Υἱοῦ ὄνομα τῷ Λόγῳ μόνῳ δεικνύναι δύνασθαι ἐπαγγέλλοιτο, εὑρήσει τοῦτο προφητικῶς εἰρημένον.

Trinity. (*e*) Finally, it is incumbent on the student to remember that the word itself, as Christ spoke it, is greater than all interpretations, for it is Spirit and Life; and that it is vain for the critic to object to the central place of the 'Christological question in the Gospel of Christ[1].' The word spoken cannot be separated from the Word who spake. 'The Christ of the Church is the dominant fact of the history of the race, and humanitarianism is inadequate, with its drastic method of levelling down the indications of the Divine in history, against which human nature protests and will continue to protest[2].'

§ 5. *The Person of Christ, according to Novatian.*

Novatian has been charged with more than one heresy in regard to the Person of Christ. According to the Danish scholar, V. Ammundsen, Epiphanius places him between Sabellius and Noetus as an upholder of the same tenets[3]; and though he himself does not endorse the charge, or even deny Novatian his place in the line of development which issued in the Nicene teaching, he goes so far as to say that, if we judge the work from the standpoint of a later orthodoxy, a whole series of heresies will come to light in it, Arianism, Apollinarism, Nestorianism and Adoptianism. We need not however follow Ammundsen to these lengths, as a careful examination of the teaching of the Treatise will shew.

[1] Refer to Harnack, *What is Christianity?*' tr. Saunders², p. 125 'Christology is treated as though the Gospel had no other problem to offer,' and p. 147.

[2] Dr Sanday in Hastings' *Dict. Bibl.*, art. 'Jesus Christ.'

[3] Ammundsen, *Novatian og Novatianismen*, p. 18, n. 2, referring to Epiphan. *Panarion. Haer.* lxv.

For this purpose, it will be best to enquire: first, what Novatian intends by the formula 'Christus deus,' which he is so zealous to defend[1]; and secondly, what is his conception of the Humanity of our Lord[2], for which he constantly invokes the foundation-text, 'Verbum caro factum'; and thirdly, in what form does he state the union of the two natures, human and Divine, in the Person of Christ?

i. We cannot examine the formula 'Christus deus' without first considering, what meaning Novatian gives to the simple idea of Godhead, as expressed in the word 'deus.' He is mainly concerned to vindicate it against the false notions of the Gnostic schools of thought on the one side, and the Patripassians on the other; the former setting a Demiurge or inferior God over against the One God, the latter confusing the Father with the Son. That is why he lays such stress on the Creative and Providential action of the One God, who 'contains all things[3],' who transcends human thought and language[4]. He is one, without an equal, and the Name of God is but a designation vouchsafed by Him to the human intelligence, which cannot grasp its content[5]. On the other hand, our conception of God ('quicquid esse potest quod deus est,' 'quicquid illud est totus[6]') must exclude all idea of human passion, physical and mental, of human frailty and mortality[7], of origin and change[8].

What then is Novatian's conception of Godhead, as it is found in the Son? An examination of his ex-

[1] Thus p. 37, ll. 15, 16 'deum credendum esse qui ex deo sit.'
[2] P. 37, ll. 14, 15 'hominem credendum esse, qui ex homine sit.'
[3] Pp. 7, l. 3; 25, l. 18.
[4] Pp. 7, ll. 18—20; 8, ll. 15—20.
[5] P. 16, ll. 4—9.
[6] Pp. 15, l. 8; 21, l. 17.
[7] Pp. 92, l. 3; 93, l. 2.
[8] Pp. 14, ll. 1—3; 21, ll. 17—21.

position will reveal certain points of difference.—Christ is 'dominus deus noster, sed dei filius' (c. ix *init.*). It is not necessary to traverse again the ground already covered by us in treating of the Pre-existence of the Son. But this much may be said here. As He is God in His origin, He was glorified in His personal essence before the world was established, and was with God to receive His command that the world should be created; and as the Word of God He descended from heaven. On earth, He shews that He knows the secrets of man's heart, He forgives sins, He heals diseases, He assures man of immortality and even of divinity[1], He is omnipresent to be invoked in worship[2], and He bestows that enduring salvation which mere man could not give[3]. If we allow that He is Son of God, we are bound to confess him God[4]. And yet He has Himself stated 'on what principle' He is God, namely, 'as the Son of God born (natus) of God,' or, 'as being the Son, not the Father[5].' From the crucial passage in Philippians ii the writer argues that He never placed Himself on the same level with the Father, 'remembering that He has what He is simply by the Father's gift[6].' The Father is 'immensus,' i.e. subject to no local limitations; the Son is, or may be, 'confined in space,' coming, as the prophet said, from the South, in other words, from Bethlehem (c. xii, p. 41 sq.)[7]. The argument against the Sabellians requires that this should refer to Him as God and not merely as Man.

Again, God the Father is invisible, no human eye can contemplate Him: He transcends the reach of thought[8].

---

[1] P. 51, ll. 10, 11.
[2] P. 46, l. 22.
[3] P. 39, ll. 12—15; 52, ll. 12—16.
[4] P. 40, ll. 21, 22.
[5] Pp. 99, l. 7; 84, ll. 12, 13; 54, l. 4.
[6] P. 81, ll. 10—13.
[7] P. 60, ll. 14—19.
[8] P. 12, ll. 9—11.

He can only be seen in His works, for His glory blinds the mental vision, even as the sun dazzles the eyes[1]. But the Son is visible at will. Novatian repeatedly pronounces Him 'the image of God the Father[2]', who is seen at work in the acts of Christ; for Christ is 'the imitator of the Father's works[3].' Just as Tertullian (*adu. Praxean* xiv, xv) holds that even before the Incarnation 'the Word was seen in a figure (in aenigmate), in dreams and visions,' Novatian recognises in the angelic visitations of the Old Testament the manifestations of Him who is 'angelus pariter et deus[4].' As Tertullian believes that by the Incarnation the Word became 'plenius uisibilis,' dwelling upon the fulfilment of the Divine promise to Moses, Novatian believes that the Son 'sets forth the Father's heart[5]' and announces His dispensation[6]: so that by seeing the image of the Father in the Son, a man may feel as if he had already seen the Father[7]. This was the meaning of the answer given to St Philip[8]. Consistently with this view, we read in ch. xxxi that there is One alone who is invisible, whom human faculties cannot grasp: for any other view would involve a ditheism. Thus far, Novatian is in practical agreement with Tertullian, in contrasting the Invisible God with the Son in whom He is visible[9]. But the former carries the thought a step further, to the idea of an advance in spiritual vision until a man can really see God. This seems out of keeping with his insistence on the absolute invisibility of the Father. But he has to controvert the position of those who

[1] P. 8, l. 20—p. 9, l. 5; 116, l. 1.
[2] E.g. p. 62, l. 10.
[3] P. 81, ll. 2, 3.
[4] P. 67, l. 19.
[5] P. 68, l. 5.
[6] P. 65, l. 4.
[7] P. 103, ll. 21—23.
[8] P. 100, ll. 6—10.
[9] Cp. *adu. Prax.* xxiv 'opera per quae pater in filio non uisu, sed sensu uidebatur.'

would identify the Son with the Father, and this leads him to contrast with the answer to Philip the blessing pronounced on the pure of heart. How could Christ promise what He had already bestowed? There must be a future vision of God[1]. We are not told how this is to be reconciled with the distinction which the writer maintains, in respect of invisibility, between the Father and the Son: he does not even raise the point, but perhaps he would find the reconciliation in the thought of an inconceivable development of man's spiritual faculty, such as the words of c. xviii may imply ('gradatim enim et per incrementa fragilitas humana nutriri debuit per imaginem ad istam gloriam, ut deum patrem uidere possit aliquando[2]'). We may also refer to what is said below (§6) on the 'Deification of man[3].'

Something must also be said upon the obedience of the Son, and it enters into Novatian's conception of His Divinity. He is 'oboediens patri qua filius[4]'; He obeys and ever has obeyed the Father in all things[5]; He holds the power over all things, but by the consignment and sufferance of His Father ('sed qua traditam, sed qua concessam, sed qua a patre proprio sibi indultam[6]'). The expression 'famulus' in ch. x[7] is another very strong assertion of this relationship of subjection. In the exposition of the cardinal passage (Philipp. ii 6), which we have in ch. xxii, he distinctly

1 P. 62, ll. 13, 14, with note.

2 P. 62, ll. 12 sq.

3 It is instructive to compare the treatment of the same question by Irenaeus (*adu. Haer.* iv 34. 5, 7); thus he says, 'homo etenim a se non uidet deum. ille autem uolens uidetur ab hominibus, a quibus uult et quando uult et quemadmodum uult...uisus quidem tunc per spiritum prophetice, uisus autem per filium adoptiue, uidebitur autem et in regno caelorum paternaliter.'

4 P. 38, l. 15.

5 P. 81, ll. 15, 16.

6 P. 96, ll. 12, 13.

7 P. 32, l. 5.

implies that, though our Lord is 'in the form of God,' it would have been usurpation on His part to claim an equality with God: far from doing so, at His nativity He took the form of a slave. (Here we may refer to what has been said in § 3 about the 'subordination' of the Son.) It is not necessary to suppose that the idea of service and obedience ('morigera oboedientia,' p. 120, l. 18) carries with it, in Novatian's mind, that of an essential inferiority of the Son, which such a phrase as 'substantiae communio' definitely excludes[1]. He would no doubt have assented to Tertullian's reference of the 'unum sumus' of St John x 30 'ad dilectionem patris qui filium diligit, et ad obsequium filii, qui uoluntati patris obsequitur[2].' He attributes to the Son of God the 'natura dei' in the way of omnipresence, and the 'uirtus dei' and 'uis diuinitatis[3].' But his position would have been greatly strengthened had he grasped the thought of 'substantia' in its later metaphysical sense.

It is just here that Novatian fails to provide a doctrine of Christ's equality with the Father, which shall give to his formula 'Christus deus' its full content. A good deal of stress is laid upon the oneness of Father and Son ('ego et pater unum sumus,' not 'unus'), but it is a moral and practical unity, described in such terms as 'concors patri suo deo inuentus,' '*unum* per concordiam et per amorem et per dilectionem[4],' rather than an essential unity. This is most apparent in the analogy drawn from the reciprocal relation of Paul and Apollos[5].

[1] P. 122, l. 9; see also p. 121, l. 16 'non aut dissonantia aut inaequalitate diuinitatis.'

[2] *Adu. Prax.* xxii.

[3] Pp. 46, l. 22; 120, l. 4; 122, l. 8; cp. *de Idol. Vanit.* c. xiv 'ut uim diuinae maiestatis ostenderet.'

[4] Pp. 123, l. 5; 97, ll. 16, 17.

[5] Ch. xxvii, p. 98, ll. 5 sq. 1 Cor. iii 8.

In that case the same expression, 'unum sunt,' is held to imply a unity in truth, faith and religion, a unity of feeling together with a distinction of persons. Perhaps it is not necessary (with Ammundsen[1]) to dismiss this as nothing more than a somewhat crude analogy drawn from human nature; for there is a Divine element in the unity of the faithful, although Novatian does not say so. Yet certainly, taken by itself, that illustration scarcely helps us towards understanding Novatian's doctrine of the unity of the Father with the Son. Earlier in the treatise he tells us that Christ claimed it 'from the conscious sense of Divinity[2]'; or again, in virtue of His origin and 'procession' from God[3]. Finally, the writer, taking up the terminology of Tertullian, declares Him to be the 'Second Person after the Father' distinguished from the Father[4].

The fact is, that Novatian was as deeply impressed as were his opponents by the fact of the Divine 'monarchia,' and finds it difficult so to reconcile this with the separate personality of the Son, as to maintain the eternity of His Divine essence. Perhaps it is not surprising that, being the man he was, he did not dwell on the love of God, to which there is a passing reference in ch. vii, as he dwells on His wisdom, power and majesty. 'Clearly what was necessary,' as Dr Ottley says[5], 'was a more profound idea of personality in regard to the Godhead.' As it is, while Novatian insists on the true 'conjunction' of the Son of God with God[6], he generally represents His Divine powers as held by Him

[1] *Nov. og Novatianismen*, p. 36.

[2] P. 44, l. 16.

[3] P. 52, ll. 19—21.

[4] Pp. 94, l. 10; 97, ll. 5, 6.

[5] *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, i 269.

[6] P. 56, ll. 12, 13.

solely by direct grant and transmission from the Father[1]. But he has another conception of the Divine Sonship—that of the 'image of God,' which might have supplied a solution of the problem which embarrassed him. It is interesting to learn, notwithstanding, that at the Council of Nicaea, at which the Novatianist Bishop Acesius was present, it appeared that his adherents, who were familiar with the *de Trinitate,* were strong advocates of the doctrine of the ὁμοούσιον[2].

Harnack, indeed, with some other scholars, represents Novatian as teaching that the Son's circumscribed existence is bound up with His task, and ceases when that task is completed[3]. Again, Dorner goes so far as to say that Tertullian and Novatian do not assert the Divinity of Christ as clearly as the Patripassians: 'prior to His generation for the creation of the world,' he says 'the Son had not a personal existence in God'; and again he says that those two writers and the Patripassians were agreed 'that the existence of the Son or the time of His origin depended on the *will* of the Father[4].' And no doubt the view which is taken of the eternity of Christ *a parte post* must vary with the view taken of His pre-existence *a parte ante.* But the closing words of the treatise, in which a 'reversion' of the Son's Divinity to the Father is asserted, will not substantiate the theory of a re-absorption which some have attempted to base upon them. As will be seen by the notes on the passage, the 'return' of the

[1] Thus p. 59, ll. 24, 25 'sed enim deo praecipiente ut homo fiat, deus refertur esse, qui hominem facit'; and p. 96, ll. 12, 13 quoted above.

[2] A. Harnack, art. 'Novatian' in *Realencyclopädie für prot. theolog. Kirch.* (Leipzig, 1902).

[3] A. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*[3] i 586 n. 2.

[4] Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ,* I ii p. 82. Consult also H. Jordan, *Theologie...Novatians,* pp. 95—99.

Son's Godhead to the Father, spoken of in that passage, is not a future thing, but an ever present fact. It is the movement by which the union of the Son with the Father is maintained. The passage must be taken in connexion with some earlier words of the same chapter —'He who is before all time, must be said to have been ever in the Father; for time cannot be attributed to Him who is before time. For He is always in the Father, or else the Father would not always be Father[1].' So again, 'He received the beginning of His birth ("principium natiuitatis") before all time.' We must admit, in conclusion, that there is a want of precision in Novatian's Christology. Christian thought was still feeling its way towards a more perfect self-expression: as yet the relativity of the Divine Sonship to the acts of Creation and Redemption almost wholly determined its composition.

ii. We must turn our attention next to the treatment which the doctrine of the Incarnation receives in the *de Trinitate*. It must be premised, that Novatian holds, with Tertullian and earlier Fathers, that two natures[2] were united in Christ, the 'filius dei' and the 'filius hominis,' each in His own 'substantia[3].' This is a 'deep and hidden mystery,' anticipated in the purpose of God and fulfilled in Jesus Christ our Lord, for the salvation of the human race[4]. It was the necessary condition of that salvation, that man and God should be brought into accord through a Mediator[5], who is not

[1] P. 117, ll. 3—6, with the notes.

[2] But neither he nor Tertullian ever uses the expression 'duae naturae.'

[3] P. 43, l. 8. So Tertull. *adu. Prax.* xxvii 'filium dei et filium hominis ...sine dubio secundum utramque substantiam in sua proprietate distantem.'

[4] P. 86, ll. 7—10.

[5] P. 46, l. 24. Cp. p. 78, ll. 7, 8 'pignerata in illo diuinitatis et humanitatis uidetur esse concordia.'

of this world and yet of this world[1].' The Scripture argument, on which Novatian entirely relies, is as strong in defence of Christ's Manhood as of His Godhead[2].

It is when we come to examine Novatian's treatment of the Humanity of our Lord that we find ourselves in considerable perplexity. What does he understand by 'homo'? There are passages which would tempt us to suppose that he identifies it with 'caro,' the corporeal nature. Ammundsen maintains that Christ is set in contrast with 'ceteri homines,' who are 'non caro tantum sed caro et anima[3],' for that in Him the 'Verbum dei' answers to 'anima' in other men. We may compare the application of Genesis xlix 11 in ch. xxi: the Flesh is the 'garment' and the Body the 'vesture' put on by the Word of God at the Nativity, cleansed by the Passion, put off at the Death, and resumed at the Resurrection. 'By this substance, received that it might be cleansed, the Humanity is expressed ("homo exprimitur").' From the operation of the Word Novatian infers the Deity of Christ: but he seems to forget for the moment that the word 'homo' includes a human will and consciousness. Was this also 'put off' at death? A similar criticism is applicable to the *a fortiori* argument from Christ's words 'Fear not them which kill the body[4].'

There are however other passages in the Treatise which may modify our judgment. In ch. xxiv we find the words 'hominem filium hominis' explained in the following line by 'homo et caro et fragilis illa substantia[5]'; and lower down, we have the expression 'homo

[1] P. 49, ll. 19—21. [2] P. 36, l. 16—p. 37, l. 10.

[3] P. 92, ll. 10—14. Ammundsen, *op. cit.* p. 37.

[4] P. 92, ll. 16 sq.

[5] P. 87, ll. 1, 2.

et illa caro corporis[1].' We might instance also the expression of ch. xvii 'postmodum secundum carnem hominem[2],' which would be pure tautology, if 'homo' is the equivalent of 'caro.' Again, by the very implication of the metaphors in 'sponsa caro' and 'mediator' and 'conexio mutua[3],' two natures are united which are in some sense *in pari materia* and not the one physical, the other spiritual. The fact is, that in his anxiety to dispose of the current fancies of a 'docetic Christ,' with his 'fabulous body' and 'sidereal flesh,' whom he apostrophises so indignantly in ch. x, Novatian was more careful to affirm the physical substance than anything else. It cannot however be denied that, strongly as he insists upon the close union of the two natures, he leaves much that is unsatisfying in his treatment of the Humanity of our Lord. Thus we read in ch. xxiv (where the notes should be consulted) that the Son of God is Son in the proper sense ('legitimus' or 'principaliter'), but that in a secondary sense that Name belongs to the 'Man in virtue of His union with the Son of God[4].' This is certainly very like the Nestorianism (so called) of a later generation.

A more serious point is raised by the words of ch. xxii:—'He was content to take upon Him the form of a slave...and the substance of flesh and body which He took upon Him by His birth, as it came to Him from the servitude of the sins of His forefathers according to His manhood[5].' This appears to leave the sinlessness of the Humanity in doubt; as also does the passage in ch. xxi which speaks of Christ as 'cleansing manhood by His Passion' ('abluens ex parte suscepti hominis

[1] P. 87, l. 17. [2] P. 59, l. 13. [3] P. 44, ll. 3, 4.
[4] See especially p. 88, l. 19 sq. [5] P. 82, ll. 1—4.

passione[1]'). It is possible that these expressions, on which a different construction may be placed, are simply unguarded: otherwise they disallow the perfection of Christ's Humanity and the true freedom of His human Will. Had the writer followed out the mediatorial doctrine into its ultimate bearings, he would scarcely have left his words as they stand. As it is, beyond the facts that Christ is invoked in prayer as mediator[2], and that salvation is in Him alone[3], and that He bestows immortality and perpetual salvation[4], soteriology proper receives little notice.

iii. In chapters xi, xxiii, xxiv we find a statement of that which was called by later theologians the 'hypostatic union.' It receives a simple expression in the words of ch. xv, 'homo est enim cum deo iunctus, et deus cum homine copulatus[5].' Tertullian had sought to state it in philosophical terms of a sort: 'uidemus duplicem statum, non confusum, sed coniunctum in *una persona*, deum et hominem Iesum[6]'; and again, 'cum *duae substantiae* censeantur in Christo Iesu[7].' We have already alluded to a certain resemblance in Novatian's teaching to that which was afterwards known as Nestorianism. It was the essence of that doctrine to draw a sharp dividing line between the Godhead and the Manhood in Christ, 'to treat them as separate personal existences, as though a man and God were joined together, so that our Lord was not one Person but two Persons, and no real union of God and man was effected

[1] P. 79, l. 14 to the end. H. Jordan (*op. cit.* pp. 136, 137) quotes *Tract. pseudo-Orig.* 203. 1 'carnem etenim hominis obnoxiam peccatis sicut uestimentum adsumpsit.'

[2] P. 46, l. 24.

[3] P. 39, ll. 12—15.

[4] Pp. 51, l. 10; 52, ll. 14, 15.

[5] See also c. xxi, p. 77, l. 18 sq.

[6] *adu. Prax.* c. xxvii.

[7] *ib.* c. xxix. Harnack, *D. G.* i[3] 553 sq.

in Him[1].' Stress was also laid upon the right choice of a word to express the conjunction of the two natures, the passible Man and the impassible God. Nestorius himself insisted on the word *συνάφεια* ('contact' or 'cohesion')[2], in preference to such terms as *κρᾶσις*, *μῖξις*, *σύγχυσις*. The student of the *De Trinitate* will find in it certain anticipations of Nestorian language. Besides what has been already cited, in regard to Novatian's treatment of the Humanity of our Lord, we find the union of the two natures expressed as follows. In c. xxi, 'the Word assumes Man and so dwells with Him and in Him among us, that neither is the humanity (*homo*) withdrawn from Christ, nor is the Divinity denied[3].' In c. xxiv, the heretics, we are told, wish to make out that 'the Man, the Son of Man, is identical with the Son of God (eundem atque ipsum, id est hominem filium hominis etiam filium dei).' Again, in the important discussion on the words of the Annunciation in the same chapter, 'the Son of God in the proper sense ["legitimus"] assumes that Holy Thing, and attaches to Himself the Son of Man[4].' Another notable expression is found in the same chapter; the Son of Man 'holds on loan ["faeneratum et mutuatum"] that which of Himself He could not possess.' The truth is, that Novatian was like Nestorius in this, that he wished to maintain the true Manhood no less strenuously than the true Godhead, in Him who is 'the pledge of concord between Deity and Humanity[5]'; and therefore he distrusted any fusion of

[1] Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, p. 45.

[2] *ib.* pp. 90, 91. We are not here concerned with the fact, now established by Mr Bethune-Baker, that Nestorius was no 'Nestorian,' *ib.* 198.

[3] Pp. 77, l. 19—78, l. 2.

[4] Pp. 88, l. 19—89, l. 3. Cp. p. 86, l. 5 'per assumptionem carnis.'

[5] P. 78, ll. 7, 8.

the two which might 'withdraw' the Manhood, and denied that a true human nativity could 'evacuate' the Godhead[1]. But in dwelling on this aspect of the matter, he forgets to analyse the third word in his constant formula 'uerbum caro *factum*,' and prefers to say that the Word 'assumes' Flesh, as though Flesh had not been taken into the very Person of the Son of God. It is plain that he had not attained to that conception of the relation between the Natures in the One Person of Christ, which to later theologians is known as the 'communicatio idiomatum.' And yet it is surely evident, from the varied and tentative character of his terminology, that he is feeling about for the right phrase to shew that it is neither a transmutation or disappearance of the human into the Divine, nor a mechanical juxtaposition of the two. It is a 'mystery.' Novatian does not set himself to find any one form of expression for this mysterious fact, nor to speculate upon the problem of the Divine Personality which it implies. As yet—like the doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity—it had not passed from the region of Christian faith and experience into that of theological reflexion.

§ 6. *The Deification of man.*

In the theology of the second and third centuries we find the hope of the human race frequently expressed in terms of a Deification: and there are two passages in the *de Trinitate*, which present this thought as it was commonly conceived: xv, p. 51, ll. 10, 11 'uerbum

[1] P. 85, ll. 5—7.

Christi praestat immortalitatem, et per immortalitatem praestat diuinitatem': and xxix, p. 109, l. 11—p. 110, l. 1, especially '(corpora) assuefacit cum caelesti uirtute misceri, et cum spiritus sancti diuina aeternitate sociari,' and 'ad decreta ipsius discunt se moderanter temperare.' In brief, Christ's word, if a man keep it, bestows an immortality which is at once the means whereby he receives Divinity, and itself 'wedded' (socia) to Divinity and the 'fruit of Divinity'; and his very body, in obeying the decrees of the Spirit, is associated with Its Divine eternity. There is a progressive scale: obedience, immortality, Deification. We may compare the words of Theophilus of Antioch (circ. A.D. 180), in regard to Adam, *ἵνα τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μισθὸν κομίσηται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀθανασίαν καὶ γένηται θεός* (*ad Autol.* 142).

The mystic idea of the kinship of God and the human soul is found at every stage of thought. The early Greek fathers felt that God became man in order that man might become God: might enter into the Vision of God, which itself is immortality. Thus Irenaeus can say, 'The glory of God is the living man; the life of men is the vision of God,' and in another place, 'each received a penny, having as the king's image and superscription the knowledge of the Son of God, which was immortality' (*adu. Haer.* iv 34. 7 and iv 58. 9, in Harvey's edition). 'If man had not been made one with God, he would not have been able to partake of immortality. For needs was that the Mediator between God and men should through His own kinship with either (*τῆς ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκατέρους οἰκειότητος*) bring both into friendship and oneness of mind (*ὁμόνοιαν*), and present man to God and make God known to man' (iii 19. 6): and finally, 'we were not

made gods at the beginning, but at first men and then gods,' with a reference to Ps. lxxxii. 6 (*v.* iv 63. 2, 3)[1].

Undoubtedly there was much in Holy Scripture to encourage such a speculation: the original account of man made in the image of God, the teaching about being made 'children of God' (e.g. 1 John iii 1, 9), St Peter's words 'partakers of the Divine nature[2]', and especially the identification of the believer with Christ in Pauline teaching. As the expectation of an imminent Parousia faded from Christian minds, the idea of a gradual and spiritual regeneration of all things—a growth of men into the likeness of God—laid an increasing hold upon them. A vaster reach is given to the Divine purpose implicit in the Incarnation, which is thus regarded not as a remedy only for the Fall, but as God's original and eternal counsel in creation[3].

The thought of man's kinship with God and progressive Deification was no novelty. It may be traced in Aristotle's words about perfect happiness: *οὐ γὰρ ᾗ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν οὕτω βιώσεται, ἀλλ' ᾗ θεῖόν τι ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπάρχει*, and again, *οὐ χρὴ ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα...ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν* (*Nic. Eth.* x 7. 8). It was a commonplace with the Stoics, who regarded the human soul as possessing, through reason, a special relationship to the Divine Being.

The later Stoics use even stronger language, Seneca,

[1] There is a useful note in Harnack, *D. G.* i³ p. 518.

[2] *v.* Bp Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, c. vi: Gen. ix 6, 1 Cor. xi 7, 2 Pet. i 4.

[3] Consult Prof. Inge, *Personal Idealism*, p. 73, and H. Jordan, *Theol. Nov.* p. 83 quoting *Tractat.* 8. 27 'similitudinem autem in Christo reseruauit, per quem qui ad imaginem dei factus fuerat rursus ad similitudinem reformaretur in ipso,' and Tertull. *de Bapt.* v 'ita restituitur homo deo ad similitudinem eius qui retro ad imaginem dei fuerat: imago in effigie, similitudo in aeternitate censetur.' (The *similitudo* is something higher than unfallen manhood, the *imago*: it is a Deification.)

Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and call the soul a 'fragment,' 'emanation,' 'particle' of God, and even roundly call its reason 'God[1].' 'God is near thee,' writes Seneca, 'is with thee, within thee, Lucilius, a sacred spirit is seated within us.' 'Reason is simply part of the Divine Spirit sunk in the human body[2].' This might equally be called Neo-Platonic.

Such language tended to a certain fluidity, as Dr Inge calls it, in the use of the word θεός, which is not without parallel in Hebrew literature. It is a consideration which we cannot afford to neglect. The Christian psychologist cannot but detect a rhetorical ring about some of the sentiments thus expressed even by orthodox Fathers.

What has Novatian to tell us about the relation of human nature to the Divine Spirit? His psychology is limited to the dualism of *caro* and *mens* (*anima*), which he contrasts with the 'simplicity' of the Divine Nature as an 'alloy of bodily elements' (c. v, p. 18, l. 5, cf. xxv, p. 92, l. 12): as regards the action of the Divine Spirit (who is 'inhabitator corporibus nostris,' xxix, p. 109, l. 10) on the human spirit, he is content to say that the mind progresses by understanding to the 'spirit,' until 'changed itself in spirit' it can know something more about God; with which we may compare i, p. 3, ll. 11, 12, 'He gave him mind, reason and prudence, that he might be able to imitate God.' This does not take us further than a 'similitudo Dei.' On the other hand, we read that the Holy Spirit is the 'Renewer of those who are dead in sin' (vii, p. 23, ll. 18, 19), this involving

[1] M. Aurel. ii 4, v 27, xii 26.

[2] Sen. *Ep. Mor.* iv 12. 1: vii 4. 12. Refer also to Lucan ix 564—580: and esp. to a valuable art. by Prof. Sonnenschein on 'the New Stoicism,' *Hibbert Journal* v 3. Also Zeller, *Stoics*, etc., Eng. tr. p. 204.

the thought that in place of a sin-laden immortality (i, p. 5, ll. 2—4) man comes to share the 'Divine eternity' of the Spirit through the obedience of holiness (xxix, p. 109. 11—p. 110. 1). It is only sin which prevents corruptible man from growing into the likeness of the incorruptible[1] God. It is the Incarnation through which flesh, the seat of corruption, is brought into contact with Deity, Christ being 'mediator Dei et hominum,' who in Himself 'clasps into harmony things of earth and things of heaven[2].' It remains to add, that the whole argument of chs. xiv, xv turns on the belief that mere man is not and cannot conceivably become what Christ is: 'since man cannot do works like unto the heavenly works of God' (xiv, p. 47, l. 12).

Here Novatian leaves us, having barely touched the real problem of the kinship of the human and Divine through the element called in the N.T. πνεῦμα. To him the Divine generally appears as transcendent rather than immanent[3]: a Power that enters *ab extra*; and the reconciliation of the 'Deus' and 'homo' in Christ is but vaguely indicated. And similarly he asserts that the will is free (i, p. 3. 15—p. 4. 8), but does not examine the content of the idea.

The question of the reconciliation of the human and the Divine finds many answers in the course of human thought. It may be said that the problem will always elicit one of two types of solution: the one theocentric and the other anthropocentric: in the former, God is transcendent, above and outside His world, in the latter

[1] iv, p. 16, l. 12.

[2] xxiii, p. 86, ll. 2, 3. Cp. 'pignerata in illo diuinitatis et humanitatis concordia,' xxi, p. 78, l. 7. Also from *de Idol. Van.* xi passage quoted *supra* p. xxi.

[3] *v.* however n. on p. 26, l. 2.

He is immanent in His world: in the one case man obeys a law, in the other he realizes his own higher nature. The circles of view will intersect, and thus common points are found. (*a*) There is a Christian pantheism, the pantheism of S. Paul when he said, 'in Him we live and move and have our being,' and spoke of the Divine Will 'to sum up all things in Christ[1]': but it must be sharply distinguished from that vague modern pantheism which can see no difference, save of degree, between God and His creature man. St Paul studiously avoids the Stoic and neo-Platonic phraseology of deification. (*b*) There is the conviction that the individual is only himself when he remembers that he exists in and for the whole[2]. Thus social service emerges as the ideal of conduct.

There is a strong resemblance between these Christian theories of Deification and the modern effort, rather Stoic than Christian, to find in Christ an apotheosis of humanity not really unique. But in the former we recognise the tendency to exalt man to the level of God, in the latter to lower God to the level of man. In each some important element is underestimated. In the latter, the Catholic Christian of every age would note that the fact of sin receives an interpretation which is unknown to Holy Scripture and fails to satisfy the deepest convictions of the human heart;

[1] Acts xvii 28: Eph. i 10.

[2] So Moberly, *Atonement*, p. 252 'Never am I, as I, so capable, so personal, so real...as when by the true indwelling of the Spirit of God, I enter into the realization of myself, as when I at last fulfil...all the unexplored possibilities of my personal being, by a perfect mirroring of the Spirit of Christ.' Also Bp Westcott, *Incarnation and Common Life*, esp. the Third Address: 'Man was broken into men that in every variety of relation he might work out his separate powers before all were summed up in the Christ,' *ib.* p. 83. Finally, refer to Bp Gore, *The New Theology and the Old Religion*, lectures iii, v.

and that accordingly the redemptive purpose of the Incarnation receives an interpretation which is wholly inadequate.

§ 7. *On the use of the term 'Person' in regard to Deity.*

A clear distinction must be made between the theological use of the word, which we have in this treatise, not quite for the first time in Christian literature, and the philosophical use, which is purely modern. Of the latter it need only be said that the belief in a Personal God is contrasted with Pantheism and with any form of Theism which represents God as Unknowable, as Impersonal Law, as the Infinite, and so forth.

It has been said, with a certain truth, 'Personality, as we conceive it, is essentially a limitation and a relation. Our own personality is presented to us as relative and limited; and it is from that presentation that all our representative notions of personality are derived. Personality is presented to us as a relation between the conscious self and the various modes of his consciousness[1].' 'It is only by conceiving God as a Conscious Being that we can stand in any religious relation to Him at all...it is from the intense consciousness of our own real existence as Persons that the conception of reality takes its rise in our minds: it is through that consciousness alone that we can raise ourselves to the faintest image of the supreme reality of God[2].'

[1] Dean Mansel, *Bampton L.* iii, p. 84.

[2] *ib.* p. 87. But read a luminous note in Dr Illingworth (*Personality, Human and Divine*, L. iii, n. 12), shewing that in God alone there is Personality, without limit but self-determining, as Lotze says, 'Perfect personality is in God alone.'

But whatever 'person' may have come to signify in later thought, in the early writers 'persona' is a term simply chosen to indicate, for no human term could express, the distinctions in the Divine Essence which we call the Trinity. So the standing formula in Tertullian is 'una substantia tres Personae'; and of baptism he says, 'nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in Personas singulas tinguimur' (*adu. Prax.* xxvi). On what principle was this term chosen? That it was chosen with deliberation we are certain: the early fathers were reluctant to go beyond the letter of Scripture, but the strange speculations of the Gnostics compelled them to interpret and comment, and formulate. In the case of this particular word, it was not necessary to do more than to refine upon a usage already to be found, in a verbal way, in 2 Corinth. i 11, ii 10, and perhaps iv 6, if the old Latin versions gave 'persona' as the equivalent of πρόσωπον there. From the original sense of a rôle or character in a play, the word *persona* came, in classical usage, to denote a 'type or representative or standing example' of a class, and even an 'individual member' of a class[1]. Still more significant is its juristic use, to denote a sort of legal abstraction: an individual or a corporation has, in the sight of the law, a *persona*—a complex of certain rights and duties[2]. Hence, starting from this legal

[1] *v. de Trin.* xviii, p. 66, l. 6 'prophetes ex p. dei': and *ib.* p. 65, l. 1 'p. angeli': xvi, p. 58, l. 4 'personarum et rerum omnium ordo.' Also my n. in Cic. *pro Cluent.* § 59 (Longmans). Its first meaning, as a stage-word, was 'an actor's mask.'

[2] Refer to a note on 'persona,' πρόσωπον, by Mr Bethune-Baker in *Texts and Studies*, vol. vii (Cambridge, 1901), p. 70 sq.; who says 'It is the *condicio*, *status*, *munus* which any one has among men in general, and in particular in civil life. And so it is the man himself so far as he has this or that *persona*. Thus slaves, as not possessing any rights of citizenship, were regarded by Roman law as not having *persona*: they were ἀπρόσωποι or *persona carentes*.'

usage, it occurred to Tertullian as the best term for his purpose: he conceives Almighty God as the 'tota substantia' from whom proceed 'officiales' to administer His Monarchy[1]. Thus it indicated essential distinctions in the Godhead (and particularly in Its operations), which such a word as *species* could not have done without risk of Sabellianism. It was first used by Tertullian of the Son, through whom the Father speaks: cp. the classical 'personam alicuius suscipere.' He is anxious to explain that neither 'substance,' the Godhead or the Manhood, loses its own 'proprietas' or is blended into a 'tertium quid,' a kind of mixture distinct from either. 'We see,' he says, 'a double state of being, not confused but conjoined in One Person[2],' in which the theological sense of Person is explicit.

The Greek equivalent in Hippolytus is *πρόσωπον*, a word which has a similar stage-origin: cp. *adu. Noet.* 14 *ἕνα θεὸν ἐρῶ, πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, οἰκονομίᾳ δὲ τρίτην τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, from which Harnack infers that as yet it was not attributed to the Holy Spirit[3].

It is well known that *ὑπόστασις* was the equivalent preferred in post-Nicene writers, as being free from any Sabellian suggestion. Like the memorable *ὁμοούσιος*, the term 'persona' is not Scriptural, but has approved itself to the Christian consciousness from the earliest ages. But we must be careful not to read into it all that a developed psychology implies, when human

[1] 'Atquin nullam dico dominationem ita unius sui esse...ita monarchiam, ut non etiam per alias proximas personas administretur, quas ipsa prospexerit officiales sibi,' *adu. Prax.* iii.

[2] *ib.* xxvii.

[3] Mr Bethune-Baker (*l.c.* p. 73) thinks that Hippolytus uses the term as a rendering of 'persona,' which he must have found in familiar use at Rome, where probably he learnt his theology.

'personality' is under discussion. It is another matter to imagine that we can get behind these theological terms to the supposed simplicity of primitive Christianity. A school of thinkers has attempted to eliminate metaphysics from theology, and to draw a sharp distinction between religious 'value-judgments' and the theoretic judgments of philosophy. But no satisfying system of thought has resulted. A place must be found for human reason, beside Revelation and the spiritual and moral faculties, in any true theology.

NOVATIANI

PRESBYTERI ROMANI

DE TRINITATE LIBER

1 I. Regula exigit ueritatis ut primo omnium credamus in deum patrem et dominum omnipotentem, id est, rerum

THE RULE OF TRUTH. *First Part.*

I. *'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth': who not only created but gave them their proper order and constituent elements. To sea and land He gave a law which they should observe, as an example to man. He made man in His own image; the elements of his body are earthly, but there was a Divine inbreathing of reason and intelligence. Man alone was created a free agent: but lest free will should break its bounds, God gave him a law, in the form of a particular command. Disobedience brought death into the world; but God tempers the penalty by cursing not man but his labours, and withholding an immortality of guilt while He gives hope through Christ. There is a region above the firmament, in which dwell the Angels: and a region below the earth, in which the souls of just and unjust await final judgment.*

1. **regula..ueritatis**] The Creed, as it existed in the Roman Church of Novatian's day, is paraphrased in these opening words and in those of chaps. ix and xxix: being itself (in this its earliest form) scarcely more elaborate than the Baptismal Formula and certainly much shorter than the later recension known to us as the 'Apostles' Creed.' Consult Harnack, *The Apostles' Creed*, c. ii (translated from article in Hauck-Herzog, *Realencycl.*), and Swete's *Apostles' Creed*, p. 14. The Creed appears in Tertullian in a fuller form, with certain Eastern elements ('*unicum* Deum,' 'secundum scripturas'), in the treatises *adu. Praxean* ii, *de Virg. Vel.* i, *de Praescr. Haeret.* xiii, xxxvi: it is called by him 'regula fidei una omnino, sola immobilis et irreformabilis' (*v.* Lumby, *Hist. of Creeds*, ch. i). So Aug. *Confess.* viii 30 (after his conversion) uses the expression 'stans in ea regula fidei.'

Thus *regula* represents κανών of Gal. vi 16; alike the 'rule of truth' and 'rule of faith,' sometimes called the 'rule of the Church,' which determines the form of her corporate life and is (in the Creeds) her corporate utterance. The modern contrast of 'forms' with 'faith' or 'life,' to the disparagement of the former, rests on a misapprehension of this idea. Cp. Westcott, *Canon of N.T.* App. A. (See Introd. p. xxvi.)

2. **deum patrem et dominum omnipotentem**] Harnack (*op. cit.* p. 72) states that in the Roman

omnium perfectissimum conditorem, qui caelum alta sublimitate suspenderit, terram deiecta mole solidauerit, maria soluto liquore diffuderit, et haec omnia propriis et condignis instrumentis et ornata et plena digesserit. nam et in solidamento caeli luciferos solis ortus excitauit, lunae candentem globum ad solacium noctis mensurnis incrementis orbis impleuit, astrorum etiam radios uariis fulgoribus micantis lucis accendit: et haec omnia legitimis meatibus circumire totum mundi ambitum uoluit, humano generi dies, menses, annos, signa, tempora, utilitatesque factura. in terris quoque altissimos montes in uerticem sustulit, ualles in ima deiecit, campos aequaliter strauit, animalium greges ad uarias hominum seruitutes utiliter instituit. siluarum quoque robora humanis usibus profutura solidauit, fruges in cibum elicuit, fontium ora reserauit, et lapsuris fluminibus infudit. post quae, ne non etiam ipsis quoque deliciis procurasset oculorum, uariis florum coloribus ad uoluptatem spectantium cuncta uestiuit. in ipso quoque mari, quamuis esset et magnitudine et utilitate mirabile, multi-

6 mensurnis α: menstruis al.

symbol the expression θεὸς πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ displaced an older expression εἷς θεὸς παντοκράτωρ: just as Tertullian omits *Patrem*. But Harnack goes on to refer this word (when it occurs) to the paternal relation of God to the Creation, rather than to any anticipation (in the mind of the author of the Creed) of 'unicum Filium eius' (in Novatian *Filium Dei*) which follows. We need only reply, with Dr Swete (*op. cit.* ch. ii), that the writers of the 2nd century constantly identify the Father of the Universe with the Father of the Only-begotten Son: thus Justin *Ap.* i 22 μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ γεγέννηται.

With regard to εἷς, 'unicus Deus' (Tertull. *l.c.*), cp. note on c. ix *init.* See also *Introd.* § 2 iii, p. xxvii, with note.

3. **haec omnia...digesserit**] 'all these [sky, land and sea] He has furnished in full and orderly distribution with their appropriate agencies': explained in what follows.

4. **solidamento**] = Gk στερεώματι; cp. Aug. *Conf.* xiii 16, and see Rönsch *Itala u. Vulgata* p. 24.

6. **mensurnis increm. orbis**] 'by her monthly phases.'

7. **uariis**] Cp. 1 Cor. xv 41.

8. **legitimis meatibus**] 'law-appointed orbits,' = 'per legem diuinam institutis,' Jackson.

9. **dies, menses**] Gen. i 14.

13. 'He has hardened the stout timber of the forests to serve the needs of man, has called forth the crops for food, has unlocked the mouths of the springs, for the flowing of the rivers.'

15. **ne non...procurasset**] 'lest He should have failed to provide also for the feast of the eyes.' Cp. *de Cib. Iud.* vi 'uentri procuratum est.'

moda animalia, nunc mediocris, nunc uasti corporis fingit, ingenium artificis de institutionis uarietate testantia. quibus non contentus, ne forte fremitus et cursus aquarum, cum dispendio possessoris humani, alienum occuparet elementum, fines litoribus inclusit: quo cum fremens fluctus et ex alto sinu spumans unda uenisset, rursum in se rediret nec terminos concessos excederet, seruans iura praescripta: ut diuinas leges tanto magis homo custodiret, quanto illas etiam elementa seruassent.

Post quae hominem quoque mundo praeposuit et quidem ad imaginem dei factum: cui mentem et rationem indidit et prudentiam, ut deum posset imitari: cuius etsi corporis terrena primordia, caelestis tamen et diuini halitus inspirata substantia: quem, cum omnia in seruitutem illi dedisset, solum liberum esse uoluit. et ne in periculum caderet rursum soluta libertas, mandatum posuit, quo tamen non inesse malum fructu arboris doceretur, sed futurum, si forte, ex uoluntate hominis de contemptu datae legis praemone-

1. **nunc mediocris**] Cp. Ps. ciii (civ) 25.

2. **de institutionis u.**] 'by the variety of His appointment': for *de* cp. l. 18 'de contemptu,' p. 120 l. 8 'de numero duorum deorum.' The sense lies between 'instrument' and 'cause,' the noun governed being abstract not concrete.

4. 'Should seize upon a foreign element at the expense of its human possessor.' Ps. civ 9.

5. **ex alto sinu**] 'from the far sweep' of the hollow, lit. 'fold': as below p. 6 l. 4 'mundi huius sinus' 'reaches.' In p. 6 l. 11 the meaning is rather 'bosom': in p. 24 l. 22 'store,' from the idea of 'emptying the lap.'

7. **ut diuinas** cet.] cp. note on p. 2 l. 8, *legitimis*.

11. **ad imaginem**] Gen. i 27.

12. 'Though the elements of his body were earthly, yet its substance was heavenly and of the Divine inbreathing.' 'Diuini halitus,' a gen. of description further explained by 'inspirata.' In the first Tractatus pseudo-Origenis *de libris SS. Scr.* (as to which *v. Introd.* § 1, p. xxi) we find this distinction between the outer man 'de limo terrae plasmatus' and the inner man '(anima inuisibilis immortalis rationabilis mobilis) ad imaginem Dei factus.' It is also frequent in Irenaeus, who holds that man can only attain his perfection through the Incarnate Son, who is 'unitus et consparsus suo plasmati secundum placitum Patris' (*adu. Haer.* iii 16. 6). Cp. *Introd.* § 6.

14. **cum omnia**] Gen. i 28.

16. **mandatum posuit**] Gen. ii 17.

17. **sed futurum ... praemon.**] 'but was forewarned that evil would follow, if at all (*si forte*), by man's exercise of his own free will in disregard of the law laid down.' For *de* cp. n. on l. 2. Perhaps *praemoneretur* is a marginal gloss

retur. nam et liber esse debuerat, ne incongruenter dei imago seruiret: et lex addenda, ne usque ad contemptum dantis libertas effrenata prorumperet: ut et praemia condigna et merita poenarum consequenter exciperet, suum iam habens illud, quod motu mentis in alterutram partem agitare uoluisset. ex quo mortalitas, inuidia utique, in ipsum redit; qui cum illam de oboedientia posset euadere, in eandem incurrit, dum ex consilio peruerso deus esse festinat. cuius tamen poenam nihilominus indulgenter temperauit, dum non tam ipse, quam labores eius maledicuntur super terra. nam et quod requiritur, non ex ignorantia uenit, sed spem hominis futurae in Christo et inuentionis et salutis ostendit: et quod

9 temperauit deus *coni.* We. 10 terra γ: terram G. 12 redemptionis et sal. *coni.* We.

on *doceretur*, and has displaced some such word as *peccaretur*. Jackson conjectured *praemanderetur*.

1. **incongruenter**] 'anomalously': cp. in a different application 1 Cor. vii 22 'seruus libertus Domini.' So Greg. Nyss. *Catech. Or.* v *sub fin.* *εἰ γάρ τις ἀνάγκη τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπεστάτει ζωῆς, διεψεύσθη ἂν ἡ εἰκὼν κατ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ μέρος, ἀλλοτριωθεῖσα τῷ ἀνομοίῳ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον*, 'if necessity had governed man, the (Divine) Image would have been falsified in this respect by its unlikeness and alienated from its archetype.'

2. **lex addenda**] 'A law had to be imposed, for fear lest an unbridled liberty should break out, even to the contempt of the Giver; so that man might receive merited rewards or due punishments as the result of his actions (*consequenter*), henceforth taking as his own doing [2 Cor. v 10] that which he had chosen to set in motion, as his mind swayed him in either direction.' This implies that in unfallen man free will is self-determining or autonomous, not moved from without: in fact it contains the germ of the developed Augustinian doctrine on that matter (e.g. in his *de Libero Arbitrio*). The relation of free will to grace in *fallen* man is not here touched upon. Consult Mozley, *Predestination*, ch. viii 206 sq., who quotes the words of Aug. *de Corr. et Grat.* c. xi, the first man 'had such an assistance given him as he could use if he willed, and neglect if he willed: not one by which it was caused that he did will.'

6. **inuidia utique**] 'simply by envy,' 'by the Devil's envy of man,' Gen. iii 5: cp. Wisd. ii 24 'inuidia diaboli intrauit mors in orbem terrarum,' and *infra* p. 13 l. 15 n. *De oboed.*, 'by obedience.' Cf. *supra* 'de institutionis uarietate.'

8. **deus esse**] Gen. iii 5.

9. **non tam ipse**] Gen. iii 17.

11. **quod requiritur...**] 'the fact that he is sought,' i.e. in Gen. iii 9, 'comes from no ignorance' on the part of God, 'but exhibits man's hope of a coming rediscovery and salvation in Christ.' For *inuentionis et s.* see Lk. xix 10 'to seek and to save.'

ne de ligno arboris uitae contingat arcetur, non de inuidiae maligno liuore descendit, sed ne uiuens in aeternum, nisi peccata Christus ante donasset, circumferret secum in poenam sui semper immortale delictum.

Quamquam etiam superioribus, id est, super ipsum quoque solidamentum partibus, quae non sunt hodie nostris contemplabiles oculis, angelos prius instituerit, spiritales uirtutes digesserit, thronos potestatesque praefecerit, et alia multa caelorum immensa spatia et sacramentorum infinita opera condiderit, ut immensus hic licet mundus paene nouissimum magis dei corporalium rerum appareat opus esse, quam solum. namque quae infra terram iacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis et

1 eiicitur ms. Wow.

1. **non ... descendit**] 'does not proceed from': cp. Gen. iii 22.

2. 'Lest...he should always bear about with him for his punishment an immortality of guilt.' The fathers commonly regard this exclusion as a mercy rather than a judgment: 'that evil might not be immortal and that the punishment might be an act of benevolence,' Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxxvii 1. See Irenaeus *adu. Haer.* iii 23. 6.

3. **donasset**] = 'condonasset.' So Novatian *apud* Cypr. *Epist.* xxx 7 quotes Mt. xviii 32 'donaui tibi omne debitum,' where Vulg. has 'dimisi.'

7. **angelos prius inst.**] The question of the creation of Angels before the universe is treated by Aug. *de Ciuit. Dei* xii 16: his conclusion being that they may have existed 'in all time,' but that time cannot be 'coeternal with the immutable eternity of the Creator': and that Angels did not exist 'before all time.' He refers Gen. i 1 (by a mystical interpretation of 'the heaven') to their creation. Cp. also the last three books of his *Confessions*. The Schoolmen, following Ecclus. xviii 1 'Qui uiuit in aeternum creauit omnia simul,' held that they were created simultaneously with the universe.

ib. **spiritales uirtutes...**] Cp. Milton *P. L.* ii 310:

'Thrones and Imperial Powers, offspring of Heaven,
Ethereal Virtues!'

Cp. Lightfoot on Col. i 16 on this subject. In Tertull. *de Praescr. Haer.* xlvii 'uirtutes illas et angelos inferiores hominem fecisse' it is a Gnostic term.

8. 'Established many other measureless spaces of heavens, and mysterious operations without limit.' In its wider sense *sacramentum* denotes a spiritual truth embodied in any outward form, be it of words or symbol, and represents the Greek *μυστήριον*. See *Dict. of Christian Antiq.* s.v. 'Sacraments.'

10. **paene nouissimum...solum**] 'is to all appearance the latest of God's material creations rather than His only work.'

12. **neque ipsa sunt**] = 'ne ipsa quidem sunt,' 'are not themselves either.' This 'region below the earth,' thus locally designated in keeping with the notion of a flat earth, is the Hades of the parable (Lk. xvi 19): in which the just and the unjust are already divided,

ordinatis potestatibus uacua. locus enim est quo piorum animae impiorumque ducuntur, futuri iudicii praeiudicia sentientes: ut operum ipsius in omnibus partibus redundantes magnitudines non intra mundi huius capacissimos licet, ut diximus, sinus conclusas uideremus, sed etiam infra ipsius mundi et profunda et altitudines cogitare possemus; et sic considerata operum magnitudine, tantae molis digne mirari possemus artificem.

II. Super quae omnia ipse continens cuncta, nihil extra 2
se uacuum deserens, nulli deo superiori (ut quidam putant) locum reliquit. quandoquidem ipse uniuersa sinu perfectae magnitudinis et potestatis incluserit, intentus semper operi suo, et uadens per omnia, et mouens cuncta, et uiuificans uniuersa, et conspiciens tota, et in concordiam elementorum omnium discordantes materias sic conectens, ut ex disparibus elementis ita sit unus mundus ista coagmentata conspiratione solidatus,

'feeling already the sentence that anticipates the coming Judgment.' The idea of a purgation is not hinted at here, any more than in Tert. *de Anima* 58, which N. probably has in view. Cp. also Hippolytus, p. 68 (Lagarde).

5. **sinus**] See n. on p. 3 l. 5. 'But also might be able to conceive of them below the abysmal depths of the world itself.'

II. *God is above all; He fills and moves all; in Him all things find their reconciliation and unity.* (*a*) *As He contains all, nothing can exist outside Him. He is infinite: nothing can transcend Him. He is eternal: nothing can precede Him, and He is without end, subject to no law of time.* (*b*) *The mind cannot conceive, the tongue cannot express Him: we can only feel, we cannot explain. Words fail, such as Light, Potency, Majesty: these are His attributes, not Himself.* (*c*) *We can only say that He is that which we cannot understand or measure, unthinkable. Eyes that gaze on the sun are only dazzled. As God and Parent of all virtues He transcends them all. He is mind begetting and filling all things, directing natural causes to the good of the whole.*

9. 'Over all these things God Himself containing all things, and leaving no space outside Himself, has allowed no room, as some fancy, for a higher God.' An allusion to the Gnostic theory of Valentinus and others that above the 'Demiurge' (or Creator) is a higher God 'Bythos' (or 'Depth') with his intermediate Aeons. The system of Mithraism, which at this period had a wide vogue throughout the empire, assigned to Mithras (the sun-god) a position like that of the Gnostic Demiurge.

15. 'That the universe has been so compacted into one by the consolidated harmony of dissimilar elements, that no force can break it up.' The whole passage amplifies Col. i 17 καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, though it may be observed that St Paul is speaking of Christ, and N. of the Father.

ut nulla ui dissolui possit, nisi cum illum solus ipse qui fecit, ad maiora alia praestanda nobis, solui iusserit. hunc enim legimus omnia continere: et ideo nihil extra ipsum esse potuisse; quippe cum originem omnino non habeat, consequenter nec exitum sentiat: nisi forte, quod absit, aliquando esse coeperit, nec super omnia sit, sed dum post aliquid esse coeperit, infra id sit quod ante ipsum fuerit, minor inuentus potestate, dum posterior denotatur etiam ipso tempore. ob hanc ergo causam semper immensus, quia nihil illo maius est; semper aeternus, quia nihil illo antiquius. id enim quod sine origine est, praecedi a nullo potest, dum non habet tempus. ideo immortalis, non deficiens in consummationis exitu. et quoniam sine lege est quicquid sine origine est, modum temporis excludit, dum se debitorem nemini sentit.

De hoc ergo, ac de eis quae sunt ipsius et in eo sunt, nec mens hominis quae sint, quanta sint, et qualia sint, digne concipere potest, nec eloquentia sermonis humani aequabilem maiestati eius uirtutem expromit. ad cogitandam enim et ad eloquendam illius maiestatem et eloquentia omnis merito muta est, et mens omnis exigua est. maior est enim mente ipsa, nec cogitari possit quantus sit, ne si potuerit cogitari, mente humana minor sit, qua concipi possit. maior est quoque omni

18 uirtutem sermonis edd. 21 potuerit *a* Pa: quia si poterit cogitari m. hum. minor sit oportet G.

3. **omnia continere**] reference perhaps to Wisd. i 7.

5. **nisi forte...**] 'unless—far be the thought from us—He began at a certain time to exist, and is not above all things.'

11. **dum non habet tempus**] 'insomuch as time is nothing with Him.' 'Non deficiens...,' 'as not passing away to a completed end.' For 'consummatio' cp. Jerem. xxx 11 (Vg.), and see Rönsch *Itala u. Vulgata* p. 310, who cites O. L. Mt. ii 15 'ad consummationem Herodis.' Cf. p. 117 l. 3 'qui ante tempus est,' with note on l. 2.

17. 'Nor can human eloquence put forth a power commensurate with His greatness.' For 'uirtutem' cp. p. 8 l. 8, p. 9 l. 9: Gk δύναμις. 'Sermonis' (*v.* crit. n.) was added in explanation.

20. 'For He is greater than the mind itself, nor can His greatness be conceived, for could it have been so conceived He would be less than the human mind which could conceive Him.' The whole passage expresses the transcendence of God as well as the limited philosophical vocabulary of Latin can express it.

sermone, nec edici possit: ne si potuerit edici, humano sermone minor sit, quo, cum edicitur, et circumiri et colligi possit. quicquid enim de illo cogitatum fuerit, minus ipso erit: et quicquid enuntiatum fuerit, minus illo comparatum circum ipsum erit. sentire enim illum taciti aliquatenus possumus; ut autem ipse est, sermone explicare non possumus. siue enim illum dixeris lucem, creaturam ipsius magis quam ipsum dixeris; ipsum non expresseris: siue illum dixeris uirtutem, potentiam ipsius magis quam ipsum dixeris et deprompseris: siue dixeris maiestatem, honorem ipsius magis quam illum ipsum descripseris. et quid per singula quaeque percurrens longum facio? semel totum explicabo: quicquid omnino de illo rettuleris, rem aliquam ipsius magis et uirtutem, quam ipsum explicaueris. quid enim de eo condigne aut dicas, aut sentias, qui omnibus et sermonibus et sensibus maior est? nisi quod uno modo (et hoc ipsum quo modo possumus, quo modo capimus, quo modo intellegere licet?) quid sit deus mente capiemus, si cogitauerimus id illum esse, quod quale et quantum sit non possit intellegi, nec in ipsam quidem cogitationem possit uenire. nam si ad solis aspectum oculorum nostrorum acies

1 ne dici possit ms. Wow. edici *coni.* Latinius *pro* dici. 17 licet *sine interrogationis nota* edd.

2. **et circumiri et colligi**] 'to be comprehended and gathered up.'

4. **minus illo comparatum circum ipsum**] 'will be incommensurate with the compass of His being.'

6. **siue enim illum dixeris lucem...**] taken from Theophilus Antioch. i 3 *εἰ γὰρ φῶς αὐτὸν εἴπω, ποίημα αὐτοῦ εἴπω.*

12. **rem...uirtutem**] 'some possession or virtue.' God in Himself transcends all human thought and language, and can only be described through His attributes: in Himself He is unthinkable.

16. **et hoc ipsum...licet**] The question only indicates the paradox of saying that our only way of conceiving of God is to affirm that He is inconceivable. Previous editors take the words as a limitation of the statement 'capiemus,' 'quo modo' meaning 'as far as.'

20. 'If the vision of the eyes begins to fail us in beholding the sun, so that their gaze cannot rest on the orb itself, overpowered by the bright rays that meet it, our mental vision undergoes the same experience in all our thinking about God: and the more it concentrates itself on the contemplation of God, the more is it blinded by the light of its own thought.' The idea is that of a mind 'dark with excess of light.'

hebescit, ne orbem ipsum obtutus inspiciat obuiorum sibi superatus fulgore radiorum, hoc idem mentis acies patitur in cogitatione omni de deo; et quanto ad considerandum deum plus intenditur, tanto magis ipsa cogitationis suae luce caecatur. quid enim de eo (ut iterum repetam) condigne dicas, qui est sublimitate omni sublimior, et altitudine omni altior, et profundo omni profundior, et omni luce lucidior, et omni claritate clarior, omni splendore splendidior, omni robore robustior, omni uirtute uirilior, omni pulchritudine pulchrior, ueritate omni uerior, et fortitudine omni fortior, et maiestate omni maior, et omni potentia potentior, et omnibus diuitiis ditior, omni prudentia prudentior, et omni benignitate benignior, omni bonitate melior, omni iustitia iustior, omni clementia clementior? minora enim sint necesse est omnium genera uirtutum eo ipso, qui uirtutum omnium et deus et parens est: ut uere dici possit id deus esse, quod eiusmodi est cui comparari nihil potest. super omne est enim quod dici potest. mens est enim quaedam gignens et complens omnia, quae sine ullo aut initio aut termino temporis causas rerum naturaliter nexas ad utilitatem omnium summa et perfecta ratione moderetur.

3 III. Hunc igitur agnoscimus et scimus deum, conditorem rerum omnium, dominum, propter potestatem, et parentem

9 uirilior] uiritior edd.: uirosior *coni.* Ja. 13 bonior *a*.

9. **uirilior**] thus I amend *uiritior*, an unknown word. Jackson suggests *uirosior* from Tertull. *de Anima* 19, which hardly supports its use here.

18. 'A mind...which without beginning or end of time orders with supreme and perfect reason, with a view to the good of the whole, causes in their natural connexions.' 'Finis omnium bonorum et altitudo uitae et profunditas eloquiorum tu es': *Imit. Christi* iii 59.

III. *This our God is Founder of all things, their Lord and Parent, as Holy Scripture shews: He maintains the balance of this earthly frame, and will not give His glory to another, made or imagined by idolater or heretic. He says that no temple contains Him, in order that we may be wise in the knowledge of His true glory. By His Spirit He would turn us from brutal pride to the gentleness of the humblehearted: that we may recognise that God, rather than Nature, is the Founder of natural order. His invisible greatness we learn through things visible: of whom and in whom and through whom are all things.*

propter institutionem: hunc inquam, qui *dixit, et facta sunt* omnia; *praecepit, et processerunt* uniuersa; de quo scriptum est: *omnia in sapientia fecisti*; de quo Moyses: *deus in caelo sursum et in terra deorsum*; qui secundum Isaiam *mensus est caelum palmo, terram pugillo: qui aspicit terram, et facit eam tremere: qui continet gyrum terrae, et eos qui habitant in ipso quasi locustae: qui expendit montes in pondere, et nemora in statera*, id est certo diuinae dispositionis examine: ac, ne facile in ruinam procumberet magnitudo inaequaliter iacens, si non paribus fuisset librata ponderibus, onus hoc moderanter terrenae molis aequauit. qui dicit per prophetam: *ego deus, et non est praeter me.* qui per eundem prophetam refert quoniam

1. **institutionem**] 'ordering,' with the idea of 'instruction' for intelligent beings, as explained below (p. 11 ll. 11—13): 'qua pater conferre sapientiam,' 'ferinos animos ...ad lenitatem trahere uolens.' See also n. on c. viii, p. 25 ll. 2, 5.

ib. Ps. cxlix 5, ciii (civ) 24: Deut. iv 30.

4. Is. xl 12, Ps. ciii (civ) 32.

6. Is. xl 22 Vulg. 'qui sedet super gyrum terrae, et habitatores eius sunt quasi locustae': *ib.* 12 'quis appendit tribus digitis molem terrae, et librauit in pondere montes, et colles in statera?' In ch. xxx *infra* the word is 'suspendit.' 'Pondere,' 'balance,' much the same as 'statera,' 'scales.' The writer in his O.T. quotations used a version made from the LXX, not, as the Vulgate, from the Hebrew; thus *ib.* v. 22 ὁ κατέχων τὸν γῦρον τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ὡς ἀκρίδες, verse 12 τίς ἔστησε τὰ ὄρη σταθμῷ καὶ τὰς νάπας ζυγῷ; Cf. notes on ch. ix and *Introd.* § 1, p. xx, note 3.

8. **examine**] prop. 'tongue of the balance,' so 'the exactness' of the Divine distribution of elements.

ib. **ne facile** sq.] 'He laid out this mighty earthly mass in just equipoise, lest if it were not held in due equilibrium, the huge ill balanced fabric should collapse and fall into ruin': cp. Ps. ciii (civ) 5 'non inclinabitur in saeculum saeculi.' 'Moderanter,' lit. 'with controlling force.' This ancient argument for a Creator gains a far wider scope of application, when we regard the universe in the light of modern science: every organism within it consisting of co-ordinated parts in equilibrium. 'The living being resembles a delicately constructed machine' (Stewart and Tait, *Unseen Universe*, ch. vi). Order prevails in the infinitesimal, as well as in the infinitely great: the most recent science has found it within the atom, which is now itself disintegrated. 'The laws of the physical universe are mathematical relations' (Prof. Flint, *Theism*, pp. 134). 'Masses attract each other, elements combine with each other, in invariable proportions' (*ib.* 136, quoting Is. xl 12, as in our text). What was called the 'argument from design' is better called the 'argument from order and adaptation,' which maintains that the order which actually exists was meant to exist (Flint, p. 164). This leads to the idea of design, of a *Causa Causans*, a Creator Mind.

11. **ego deus**] Is. xlv 18, 22.

maiestatem meam non dabo alteri; ut omnes cum suis figmentis ethnicos excludat et haereticos, probans deum non esse qui manu artificis factus sit, nec eum qui ingenio haeretici fictus sit. non est enim deus, cui, ut sit, quaerendus est artifex. quique adhuc adiecit per prophetam: *caelum mihi thronus est, terra autem scabellum pedum meorum: qualem mihi aedificabitis domum, aut quis locus requiei meae?* ut ostendat quoniam multo magis illum templum non capit, quem mundus non capit. et haec non ad sui iactantiam, sed ad nostri scientiam refert. neque enim ipse a nobis desiderat magnitudinis gloriam, sed nobis uult religiosam, qua pater, conferre sapientiam. quique praeterea ferinos nostros animos et de agresti immanitate tumidos et abruptos ad lenitatem trahere uolens, dicit: *et super quem requiescet spiritus meus, nisi super humilem et quietum, et trementem uerba mea?* ut deum aliquatenus quantus sit possit agnoscere, dum illum per spiritum collatum discit timere. qui similiter adhuc magis in notitiam nostri uolens peruenire, ad culturam sui nostros excitans animos, aiebat: *ego sum dominus, qui feci lucem et creaui tenebras*; ut uicissitudinum istarum quibus noctes diesque moderantur non naturam nescio quam putaremus artificem, sed deum agnos-

21 putaremus *ex ms. Woweri* Ja: -emus al.

1. **maiestatem meam**] Is. xlii 8.

3. **manu artificis**] Cp. Hos. viii 6, Acts xix 26.

ib. **qui ingenio haer. fictus sit**] Tertullian speaks of heretics, 'neque ab idololatria distare haereses, cum auctoris...eiusdem sint, cuius et idololatria Deum aut fingunt alium aduersus Creatorem, aut si unicum Creatorem confitentur, aliter eum disserunt quam in uero' (*de Praescr.* xl).

5. Is. lxvi 1.

12. 'To draw to gentleness our souls beastlike and in their rude untamed condition proud and obstinate.' The idea of advance from *feritas* to *humanitas* is frequent in classical Latin, e.g. Lucr. v 925 sq., Cic. *de Off.* iii § 32.

14. Is. lxvi 2 Vg. 'ad quem autem respiciam nisi ad pauperculum et contritum spiritu?'

15. **aliquatenus**] 'in a measure': as far as finite minds can understand.

16. **per spiritum collatum**] 'through the bestowal of the Spirit': cp. 1 Jo. iii 24.

19. Is. xlv 7.

20. **non naturam nescio quam**] 'not something called Nature': in general reference to the pantheistic view of Nature, held especially by the Stoics: as described, e.g., in Cicero *de Nat. Deorum* i § 100, 'who, judging from results so magnificent and glorious, when they looked upon the universe itself, and upon its parts, the sky, the lands

ceremus potius (quod erat uerius) conditorem. quem quoniam obtutu oculorum uidere non possumus, de operum magnitudine et uirtute et maiestate condiscimus: *inuisibilia enim ipsius*, inquit apostolus Paulus, *a creatura mundi per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur; sempiterna quoque eius uirtus et diuinitas*: ut animus humanus ex manifestis occulta condiscens, de operum magnitudine, quae uideret, mentis oculis artificis magnitudinem cogitaret. de quo idem apostolus: *regi autem saeculorum immortali, inuisibili, soli deo honor et gloria.* euasit enim oculorum contemplationem, qui cogitationis uicit magnitudinem: *quoniam*, inquit, *ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia.* nam et imperio eius omnia, ut *ex ipso* sint: et

1 auditorem ms. Wow. *unde* conditorem Wow. auctorem F. Ursin.

and the seas, and upon their ornaments, the sun, the moon and the stars, and when they marked the maturing of the seasons, and their changes and alternations ['mutationes uicissitudinesque'], conceived the existence of a sublime, exalted power that had created these things ['aliquam excellentem esse praestantemque naturam, quae haec effecisset'] and moved and controlled and directed them' (tr. by Prof. F. Brooks). Similarly (*ib.* ii § 58) the founder of the Stoics, Zeno, declared that Nature was, in the case of the universe, 'non artificiosa solum, sed plane *artifex*.' The writer probably remembered the passage.

1. **quod erat uerius**] 'as is more true': the tense assimilated to the imperf. *aiebat*, *agnosceremus*.

2. 'We learn to know Him by the greatness of his works.' Cp. Wisd. xiii 1—5. For 'de' *v.* n. on p. 3 l. 2.

3. **inuisibilia enim**] Rom. i 20.

7. **mentis oculis**] *οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας*, Eph. i 18. Cp. the famous line of Epicharmus, *νοῦς ὁρῇ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει, τἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά.*

8. **regi autem**] 1 Tim. i 17.

11. Rom. xi 36. The Greek has *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, as the Origin: *δι' αὐτοῦ*, as the Efficient Cause of all things, referred generally, but not always, to the Son (Heb. ii 10, Westcott), to whom *uerbo eius digesta* points: *εἰς αὐτόν*, as the Final Cause or Goal, expressed in Hebr. *l.c.* by *δι' ὅν*, and rendered by N., as in Vg., by *in ipso*. The distinction between *ἐν* and *εἰς* is not rigidly observed in the Latin versions; see e.g. Matt. xxviii 19, Rom. vi 3 (Vg.), 1 Cor. viii 6 (where Hilary and others read 'in illo' or 'in ipso'), xii 13 (Vulg. 'in uno spiritu'). It is not indeed certain that the N.T. writers were always clear upon it themselves (Blass *Gr. of N.T.* § 39. 3). Here the closing words associate *in ipso* and *in ipsum*: the former suggesting to us Col. i 17 (*v.* Lightfoot), Christ the 'principle of cohesion in the universe'; the latter 1 Cor. xv 28, the consummation of all sentient existence in God. It is to be observed that N. does not, like many other patristic writers, make the three clauses refer to the three Persons of the Trinity respectively.

uerbo eius digesta, ut *per ipsum* sint: et in iudicium eius recidunt uniuersa, ut dum *in ipso* exspectant libertatem corruptione deposita, in ipsum uideantur esse reuocata.

4 IV. Quem *solum* merito *bonum* pronuntiat dominus: cuius bonitatis totus testis est mundus, quem non instituisset, nisi bonus fuisset. nam si *omnia bona ualde*, consequenter ac merito et quae instituta sunt bona bonum institutorem probauerunt, et quae a bono institutore sunt, aliud quam bona esse non possunt. ex quo omne malum facessit a deo. nec enim potest fieri ut sit initiator aut artifex ullius mali operis, qui nomen sibi perfecti uindicat et parentis et iudicis, maxime cum omnis mali operis uindex sit et iudex; quoniam et non aliunde occurrit homini malum, nisi a bono deo recessisset. hoc autem ipsum in homine denotatur: non quia necesse fuit, sed quia ipse sic uoluit. unde manifeste et quid malum esset apparuit, et, ne inuidia in deo esse uideretur, a quo malum ortum esset, eluxit.

9 facessat edd. 13 recessisse *coni.* Latinius: Ja.

2. **libertatem**] Rom. viii 21.

IV. *God alone is good and the Author of good: evil is a departure from Him. God is unchanging without increase or decrease: the former would involve origin, the latter death: but He saith, I am that I am. For where there is no birth, there can be no change. Therefore He is One, the Supreme Being, without any like unto Him: for there cannot be two Infinites: He must contain the whole or else cease to be God. Consequently no proper Name of God can be uttered: for a name must cover the attributes comprehended, which in this case is impossible. The Name is given that men may find mercy thereby. God's immortality follows.*

4. **solum...bonum**] Lk. xviii 19.

6. **omnia bona**] Gen. i 31.

9. **facessit**] (thus I emend 'facessat') 'is a departure from God.' Here the word is equivalent to *abhorret*, or *recedit*. For the literal sense cp. Liv. i 47. 5 'facesse hinc Tarquinios.' *Proficiscor* contains the same root.

12. The sentence is irregular but expressive, 'evil does not cross man's path from any other quarter, unless he had gone back from the good God.' So Jer. ii 19 'malum et amarum est reliquisse te Dominum Deum tuum.'

13. **hoc...ipsum**] sc. declension from God. 'Denotatur,' 'is stigmatised,' cp. Ecclus. xix 5 (Vg.) 'qui gaudet iniquitate denotabitur'; or merely 'designated' as p. 119 l. 15.

15. 'Hence it plainly appeared what evil was [sc. the defect of the will], and lest there should be any appearance of jealousy in God, it became manifest from whom evil had taken its origin,' sc. from the Devil, who was jealous of man, p. 4 l. 6.

Hic ergo semper sui est similis, nec se umquam in aliquas formas uertit aut mutat, ne per immutationem etiam mortalis esse uideatur. immutatio enim conuersionis portio cuiusdam comprehenditur mortis. ideo nec adiectio in illo umquam ullius aut partis aut honoris accedit, ne quid umquam perfecto defuisse uideatur; nec detrimentum in eo aliquod agitur, ne gradus mortalitatis receptus esse uideatur: sed quod est, id semper est, et qui est, semper ipse est, et qualis est, semper talis est. nam et incrementa originem monstrant, et detrimenta mortem atque interitum probant, et ideo: *ego*, ait, *sum deus*, *et non sum mutatus*, statum suum tenens semper, dum id quod natum non est, conuerti non potest. hoc enim in ipso, quicquid illud potest quod est deus, semper sit necesse est, ut semper sit deus, seruans sese uirtutibus suis. et ideo dicit: *ego sum qui sum.* quod enim est, ideo hoc habet nomen, quoniam eandem semper sui obtinet qualitatem. immutatio enim tollit illud nomen 'quod est': quicquid enim aliquando uertitur, mortale ostenditur hoc ipso quod conuertitur: desinit enim esse quod fuerat, et incipit consequenter esse quod non erat. idcirco et merito in deo manet semper status suus, dum sine detrimento commutationis semper sui et similis et aequalis est. quod enim

15 et id quod *conu.* We.

2. Jas. i 17.

3. 'The alteration implied in change from one thing to another involves a fraction of what might be called death.'

6. **nec detrimentum** sq.] 'nor is there any question of diminution in Him, lest it should seem that a step to mortality had been taken.' Absolute perfection excludes the possibility of change to less or more of a quality.

8. **quod est...qui est...qualis est**] His essence, Person, attributes.

11. Mal. iii 6.

13. **hoc enim in ipso**] 'Whatever powers Deity possesses must always be in Him.' The want of abstract terms makes the Latin bald and uncouth, in contrast with Greek. The phrase 'quod est deus' to express 'Godhead' is a particularly frequent one in Hilary *de Trinitate*.

15. **ego sum qui sum**] Ex. iii 14.

ib. **quod enim est...**] 'That which is, is so called,' i.e. is said to 'be,' 'just because it always preserves the same attributes.' Thus the Self-existence of God implies the permanence of His attributes.

21. **dum sine detrimento** sq.] 'for without change or loss He is always Himself and invariable.'

natum non est, nec mutari potest: ea enim sola in conuersionem ueniunt, quaecumque fiunt uel quaecumque gignuntur; dum quae aliquando non fuerant, discunt esse nascendo, atque ideo nascendo conuerti. at enim illa quae nec natiuitatem habent nec artificem, excluserunt a se demutationem, dum in qua conuersionis causa est, non habent originem.

Ideo et unus pronuntiatus est, dum parem non habet: deus enim, quicquid esse potest quod deus est, summum sit necesse est. summum autem quicquid est, ita demum summum esse oportet, dum extra comparem est. et ideo solum et unum sit necesse est, cui conferri nihil potest, dum parem non habet. quoniam nec duo infinita esse possunt, ut rerum dictat ipsa natura. infinitum est autem, quicquid nec originem habet omnino, nec finem. excludit enim alterius initium, quicquid occupauerit totum. quoniam si non omne id quod est, quicquid est, continet, dum intra id inuenitur quo continetur, minus inuentum eo quo continetur, deus esse desierit, in alterius potestatem redactus, cuius magnitudine, qua minor, fuerit inclusus: et ideo quod continuit, deus potius esse iam coeperit.

Ex quo effectum est ut nec nomen dei proprium possit edici, quoniam non possit nec concipi. id enim nomine continetur, quicquid etiam ex naturae suae condicione com-

7 deus enim. quicquid F. Jun.

5. **dum in qua conuersionis...**] 'not having beginning, in which lies the cause of change.' Birth is a change from not-being to being. Cp. Plato *Republ.* 381 (one of his 'types of theology') 'God, too, cannot be willing to change: being, as is supposed, the fairest and best that is conceivable, every God remains absolutely and for ever in his own form' (tr. Jowett).

7. **deus enim quicquid** cet.] 'For God must be in the highest degree whatever Godhead can be.' Cp. p. 14 lines 13, 14 for the form of expression.

15. **quoniam si non omne...**] 'Since if it (the Infinite) does not contain all that exists (whatever it be), then being found within that which contains it, it is less than the containing element, and thereby will have ceased to be God.' 'Et ideo quod'...' and therefore that which contained will rather claim to be God.'

21. **nec concipi**] = 'ne concipi quidem,' a frequent use of *nec*: so *nec ipsis intellectibus* below. Cp. 'tu voluptatem summum bonum putas: ego nec bonum,' Sen. *Dial.* 7. 10. But it is less often found (as here) after a principal negative. N. here repeats what he has said above in c. ii.

prehenditur. nomen enim significantia est eius rei, quae comprehendi potuit ex nomine. at quando id de quo agitur tale est, ut condigne nec ipsis intellectibus colligatur, quomodo appellationis digne uocabulo pronuntiabitur, quod, dum extra intellectum est, etiam supra appellationis significantiam sit necesse est? ut merito quando nomen suum deus ex quibusdam rationibus et occasionibus adicit et praefert, non tam legitimam proprietatem appellationis sciamus esse depromptam, quam significantiam quandam constitutam; ad quam dum homines decurrunt, dei misericordiam per ipsam impetrare posse uideantur.

Est ergo et immortalis et incorruptibilis, nec detrimenta sentiens omnino, nec finem. nam et quia incorruptibilis, ideo et immortalis; et quia immortalis, utique et incorruptibilis; utroque inuicem sibi et in se conexione mutua perplexo, et ad statum aeternitatis uicaria concatenatione producto, et immortalitate de incorruptione descendente, et incorruptione de immortalitate ueniente.

7 aut praefert ms. Wow. 15 perplexa...producta: *corr.* edd. Angl.

1. **nomen enim significantia...**] 'a name is the indication of that thing which from the name could be comprehended,' sc. by the intellect. But the significance of *this* Name cannot so be grasped. For *significantia* cp. p. 20 l. 18.

6. **ut merito** sq.] 'So that rightly enough, when God attaches and exhibits His Name upon certain grounds and occasions, we know that strictly and properly it is not a word of designation, but rather a general indication that has been given.' In what follows, the O.T. use of the Name of the Lord is shewn, as e.g. in Prov. xviii 10. See Hilary *de Trin.* v 21 'loquendum non aliter de deo est quam ut ipse ad intellegentiam nostram de se locutus est.'

12. **est ergo**] sc. 'deus.' On 'incorruptibility,' *v. Introd.* § 5, p. lvi.

16. 'And extended by reciprocal implication into the condition of eternity.'

V. *If anger and hatred are predicated of God in Scripture, they are not vices and passions in Him, who is incorruptible and impassible. His anger and hatred are deliberate and rational, and have a remedial purpose towards mankind. Whereas human nature is formed of diverse elements, which the vice of anger rouses to discord, the Divine Nature is simple and cannot be corrupted.*

This chapter alone, rather than ch. vi, touches the modern cavil against the anthropomorphism of Christian teaching. 'An anthropomorphic God is the only God whom men can worship, and also the God whom modern thought finds it increasingly difficult to believe in' (Morison *Service of Man* p. 49, quoted *Lux Mundi*[3] p. 97 q. v.). The word itself is misleading:

5 V. Cuius etiam si iracundias legimus, et indignationes quasdam descriptas tenemus, et odia relata cognoscimus, non tamen haec intellegimus ad humanorum relata esse exempla uitiorum. haec enim omnia, etsi hominem possunt corrumpere, diuinam uim non possunt omnino uitiare. passiones enim istae in hominibus merito esse dicentur, in deo non merito iudicabuntur. corrumpi enim per haec homo potest, quia corrumpi potest: corrumpi per haec deus non potest, quia nec corrumpi potest. habent igitur ista uim suam quam exerceant, sed ubi praecedit passibilis materia, non ubi praecedit impassibilis substantia. nam et quod irascitur deus, non ex uitio eius uenit, sed ad remedium nostri illud facit. indulgens est enim etiam tunc cum minatur, dum per haec homines ad recta reuocantur. nam quibus ad honestam uitam deest ratio, metus est necessarius, ut qui rationem reliquerunt, uel terrore moueantur. et ideo omnes istae uel iracundiae dei, uel odia, uel quaecumque sunt huiusmodi, dum ad medicinam nostram proferuntur (ut res docet), ex consilio, non ex uitio uenerunt,

1 legitimas: *corr.* edd. Angl.

anthropopathy or anthropopsychism would give the real content of the idea. True, Harnack (*D. G.* i[3] 531) expresses thus the teaching of the older fathers (as Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus)—'God is all light, all understanding, all Logos, all spiritual activity: everything anthropopathic and anthropomorphic must be excluded from the conception of God': but one of his references to Tertullian is enough to shew that the moral and spiritual attributes, which appear in man in an infinitely less degree, are by that father predicated of God: 'proponam, Deum non potuisse humanos congressus inire, nisi humanos et sensus et affectus suscepisset, per quos uim maiestatis suae, intolerabilem utique humanae mediocritati, humilitate temperaret' (*adu. Marc.* ii 27).

1. **iracundias**] the plural of abstract words of feeling denotes particular instances of that feeling: 'dolores, gaudia,' 'recurrences of pain, triumph.'

3. **ad humanorum** cet.] 'narrated of Him in the sense in which these are human vices.'

4. 'All these affections, though they may corrupt human nature, cannot at all impair the Divine essence.' In the next sentence, *passiones* must be taken as the predicate, *istae* being attracted into agreement: such things may rightly be called 'passions' in men, man starting with a 'passibilis materia.' Observe the contrast between *materia* and *substantia.*

15. **ut qui rationem...**] 'in order that those who have abandoned reason may be moved, though it were only by terror.'

18. **ex consilio**] 'of set purpose.'

nec ex fragilitate descendunt; propter quod etiam ad corrumpendum deum ualere non possunt. materiarum enim in nobis, ex quibus sumus, diuersitas ad iracundiae consueuit corrumpentem nos excitare discordiam; quae in deo uel ex natura uel ex uitio non potest esse, dum non utique ex coagmentis corporalibus intellegitur esse constructus. est enim simplex, et sine ulla corporea concretione, quicquid illud est totus, quod se solus scit esse; quandoquidem *spiritus* sit dictus. et ideo haec quae in hominibus uitiosa sunt et corrumpentia, dum ex corporis ipsius et materiae corruptibilitate nascuntur, in deo corruptibilitatis uim exercere non possunt, quoniam quidem, ut diximus, non ex uitio sed ratione uenerunt.

VI. Et licet scriptura caelestis ad humanam formam 6

11 quandoquidem Pa.: quoniam quidem α γ.

2. **materiarum ... discordiam**] Anger in man is represented as a conflict of discordant elements in his nature which 'breaks him up' (*corrumpit*): doubtless the elements of reason and passion, or the spiritual and the corporeal. On the other hand God is represented as 'in any case understood not to consist of bodily elements in amalgamation.' 'That Whole which He alone knows Himself to be, though we cannot define it ['quicquid illud est'], is simple and without the admixture of anything bodily.' For the expression see p. 21 l. 17, with note. The reference is to Jo. iv 24. There is some tendency, in Christian thought, to adopt the Platonic position, a dualism which disparages the body; and we are reminded of Virgil's purgatory for souls,

'donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,
concretam exemit labem, purumque reliquit
aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem,'

Aen. vi 745—747. (Refer to *Introd.* § 5, p. lviii.)

But there was always another tendency of thought, to which Tertullian gave an extreme expression—'Who will deny that God, though He is mind, is also body? For a spirit is a body of its own kind after its own image. But even things invisible have their own body and their own form with God, through which they are visible to God alone' (*adu. Praxean* vii).

The solution of the problem (the relation of finite and infinite elements) must depend on the meaning given to the Incarnation (*v.* Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, lectures ii, iii, esp. pp. 53, 74).

VI. *The anthropomorphic language of Holy Scripture is not intended to confine the Divine majesty within human and corporeal limits: the language of the prophets was parabolic, adapted to the understanding of the people, which was finite. God is a Spirit: and it is His spiritual potencies which are represented by such terms as eyes, ears, feet. Such members are not necessary to God, who has no complexity of nature, and is all sight, all hearing, and so forth. A diversity of members would imply birth and dissolution.*

faciem diuinam saepe conuertat, dum dicit: *oculi domini super iustos*; aut dum: *odoratus est dominus deus odorem bonae fragrantiae*; aut dum traduntur Moysi tabulae *scriptae digito dei*; aut dum populus filiorum Israel de terra Aegypti *manu ualida et bracchio excelso* liberatur; aut dum dicit: *os enim domini locutum est haec*; aut dum terra *scabellum pedum* dei esse perhibetur; aut dum dicit: *inclina aurem tuam, et audi*; nos qui dicimus, quia lex spiritalis est, non intra haec nostri corporis liniamenta modum aut figuram diuinae maiestatis includimus, sed suis illam interminatae magnitudinis (ut ita dixerim) campis sine ullo fine diffundimus. scriptum est enim: *si ascendero in caelum, tu ibi es: si descendero ad inferos, ades: et si assumpsero alas meas, et abiero trans mare, ibi manus tua apprehendet me, et dextera tua detinebit me.* rationem enim

8 sed nos γ: nos edd. Angl.

1 sq. The reff. are to Ps. xxxiii 16, Gen. viii 21, Ex. xxxi 18, Ps. cxxxv (cxxxvi) 12, Is. i 20, lxvi 1, 2 K. xix 16.

8. **nos qui dicimus...**] 'we who say that the law is spiritual do not confine the fashion or shape of the Divine majesty within these outlines of our own bodily nature, but extend it, if I may so say, over the field of its own illimitable greatness without any bounds.' Ammundsen (*Novatianus* p. 29), referring to Dom Butler's article in the *Journal of Theol. Studies* Oct. 1900, p. 114, compares this passage with the Catena fragment of Origen, Delarue ii 25. He says that it is not impossible that N. had read the work of Origen, though he shews no trace of his theological influence; but (like Butler) he thinks it more probable that N. knew the writing of Melito which Origen combats in that passage.

10. **ut ita dixerim**] qualifying the metaphor: so in *de Cib. Iud.* iv *init.*, *v.* Introd. p. xix, note 4.

12. Ps. cxxxviii (cxxxix) 8, 9, 10.

13. **et abiero trans mare**] The quotation agrees neither with LXX nor Vulg., while it omits κατ' ὄρθρον (diluculo), possibly following the variant κατ' ὀρθόν. The writer used an old Latin version which, in this case, diverges from LXX more than usual. See Sabatier's *Vetus Italica ad loc.* and cf. note on iii, l. 9.

14. **rationem enim** cet.] N.'s use of the words *temperamentum* and *dispositio* elsewhere helps us to understand his meaning here. In his epistle numbered xxx among those of Cyprian he twice uses the former word: § 7 'sed in ipsius postulationis lege temporis facto temperamento,' i.e. 'but using moderation with regard to times and seasons in the form of their petition'; § 8 'cuius temperamenti moderamen nos hic tenere quaerentes,' i.e. 'we here are thinking of exercising this reasonable moderation.' With this use may be compared Cyprian's own in *Ep.* v 2 'prouidete ut cum temperamento (with moderation) fieri hoc tutius possit,' contrasted with 'glomeratim ...per multitudinem semel iunctam'; and in *Ep.* liv 3 'nos tempera-

diuinae scripturae de temperamento dispositionis cognoscimus. parabolis enim adhuc, secundum fidei tempus, de deo prophetes tunc loquebatur, non quomodo deus erat, sed quomodo populus capere poterat. ut igitur haec sic de deo dicantur, non deo sed populo potius imputetur. sic et tabernaculum erigere populo permittitur; nec tamen deus intra tabernaculum clusus continetur. sic et templum exstruitur; nec tamen deus intra templi angustias omnino saepitur. non igitur mediocris est deus, sed populi mediocris est sensus; nec angustus deus, sed rationis populi angustus est intellectus habitus. denique in euangelio: *ueniet hora*, dominus aiebat, *cum neque in monte isto, neque in Hierusalem adorabitis patrem*, et causas reddidit dicens: *spiritus est deus; et eos ergo qui adorant in spiritu et ueritate adorare oportet.* efficaciae igitur ibi diuinae per membra monstrantur: non habitus dei, nec corporalia liniamenta ponuntur. nam et cum oculi describuntur, quod omnes uideat exprimitur; et quando auris, quod omnia audiat proponitur; et cum digitus, significantia quaedam uoluntatis aperitur; et cum nares, precum quasi odorum perceptio ostenditur; et cum manus, quod creaturae sit omnis auctor probatur; et quando bracchium, quod nulla natura contra robur ipsius repugnare

7 clusus: *v. p.* 41. 4.   16 omnes γ: -ia *ultro corr.* Pa.

mentum tenentes...iusta moderatione agenda librauimus.' We have already had an example of *dispositio* in § 3 'certo diuinae dispositionis examine' in the sense of 'providential ordering.' Cp. *de Cib. Iud.* 2 'haec omnia gratia...et dispositione diuina, ne aut minus redderetur robustioribus...aut amplius tenerioribus.' In the present passage, accordingly, N. seems to mean, 'The meaning, or doctrine, of Holy Scripture may be gathered from the considerate manner in which it is vouchsafed to us.'

2. **secundum f. tempus**] 'according to the period reached in the development of faith'; i.e. as the age was capable of believing.

4. **ut igitur...**] 'for such language [of anthropomorphism] being applied to God, the people and not God must be held accountable.'

8. **mediocris**] 'finite,' lit. 'ordinary' or 'commonplace,' and so *de Laud. Martyr.* ix, xviii 'humana mediocritas': cp. 'mediocritati,' Tertull. *adu. Marc.* ii 27, quoted *supra* ch. v, introd. note.

10. **angustus**] (passive sense) 'straitened.'

11. **ueniet hora**] Jo. iv 21, 24.

14. **efficaciae**] 'potencies': 'habitus,' 'appearance.' The following passage is a fine defence of the 'anthropomorphism' of Holy Scripture.

possit edicitur; et quando pedes, quod impleat omnia nec sit quicquam ubi non sit deus, explicatur. neque enim sunt ei aut membra aut membrorum officia necessaria, ad cuius solum etiam tacitum arbitrium et seruiunt et adsunt omnia. cur enim requirat oculos, qui lux est? aut cur quaerat pedes, qui ubique est? aut cur ingredi uelit, cum non sit quo extra se progredi possit? aut cur manus expetat, cuius ad omnia instituenda artifex est et silens uoluntas? nec auribus eget, qui etiam tacitas nouit uoluntates. aut propter quam causam linguam quaerat, cui cogitare iussisse est? necessaria enim haec membra hominibus fuerunt, non deo, quia inefficax hominis consilium fuisset, nisi cogitamen corpus implesset; deo autem non necessaria, cuius uoluntatem non tantum sine aliqua molitione opera subsequuntur, sed ipsa statim opera cum uoluntate procedunt. ceterum ipse totus oculus, quia totus uidet; et totus auris, quia totus audit; et totus manus, quia totus operatur; et totus pes, quia totus ubique est. idem enim, quicquid illud est totus, aequalis est, et totus ubique est. non enim habet in se diuersitatem sui, quicquid est simplex. ea enim demum in diuersitatem membrorum recident, quae ueniunt ex natiuitate

1. **quod impleat...**] 'it is explained that He fills all things and that the place does not exist where God is not.'

4. **etiam tacitum**] 'even unexpressed.'

ib. **seruiunt..omnia**] Ps. cxviii (cxix) 91.

9. 'Whose thought is a command.' Man's purpose fails of a result, 'unless his body fulfils his thought': the result follows the will of God without an effort (*molitione*) or rather attends it simultaneously.

12. **cogitamen**] ἅπαξ εἰρημένον: the lexicons refer to Tertullian (sic) *de Trin.* 6.

17. **idem enim** cet.] The phrase 'quicquid illud est totus' has occurred before, in the sense of the undivided fulness of the Godhead, which we cannot presume to define. The same must be the meaning here. 'Aequalis' seems to mean 'unvarying,' 'the same throughout,' i.e. without any differentiation of parts. N. wishes to say that the entire sum of God's being (however little we may be able to understand what that sum is) is absolutely one and incapable of being distributed into parts, and is wholly everywhere.

19. 'It is only those things, which proceed from birth to dissolution, which will be resolved into diversity of members: those things which are not composite are unconscious of such diversities.' Cp. Bp Butler's contrast of the 'indivisible' consciousness of our own existence with the 'discerptible' material body (*Analogy* I i).

in dissolutionem. sed haec quae concreta non sunt sentire non possunt. quod enim immortale est, quicquid est, illud ipsum unum et simplex et semper est. et ideo quia unum est, dissolui non potest; quoniam quicquid est illud ipsum extra ius dissolutionis positum, legibus est mortis solutum.

VII. Sed illud quod dicit dominus spiritum deum, 7
putem ego sic locutum Christum de patre, ut adhuc aliquid plus intellegi uelit quam spiritum deum. hominibus enim licet in euangelio suo intellegendi incrementa faciens disputet, sed tamen et ipse sic adhuc de deo loquitur hominibus, quomodo possunt adhuc audire uel capere; licet, ut diximus, in agnitionem dei religiosa iam facere incrementa nitatur. inuenimus enim scriptum esse quod deus caritas dictus sit; nec ex hoc tamen dei substantia caritas expressa est: et quod lux dictus est; nec tamen in hoc substantia dei est: sed totum hoc de deo dictum est quantum dici potest; ut merito

1 sed hanc Ja. 8 putem *a*: -o edd. 10 facientibus edd. *corr.* We. 13 incrementa...scriptum esse *apud Migne excidit.*

VII. *But even when God is called a Spirit, this is not an exhaustive definition: any more than when He is called Love or Light. Such designations are given in order to lead men onwards to the recognition of God, whom the heart and mind of man cannot grasp. The very expression 'Spirit' is material in its origin: no less than Fire, which is applied to God in the O. T.*

9. 'For though Christ discourses to men in His Gospel to give them fresh measures (*incrementa*) of understanding, nevertheless, even He still speaks of God to men so far only (*sic*) as they are able to hear or to bear it, allowing that, as was said before, He strives to make their religion progress towards the recognition of God.' N. refers to p. 11 l. 11 'nobis uult religiosam.. conferre sapientiam.' 'For we find in Scripture that God is called Charity; it does not therefore follow that the substance of God is expressed in the term "Charity." Again, because He is called Light, it does not follow that the substance of God is contained in this. The whole is predicated of God only as far as it applies. So that with good reason again, when He is called a Spirit, it is not an exhaustive definition (lit. He is not called the whole of what He is): the purpose is, that, when man's mind progresses as far as the conception of Spirit, having itself undergone a spiritual change, it may be enabled, through the Spirit, to conclude that God is something even greater.' The latter words may embody, indistinctly, the thought of 2 Cor. iii 15—18.

11. **quomodo possunt adhuc audire** edd.] If *adhuc* is genuine, it takes up the *adhuc* of the principal sentence: 'still,' i.e. even under N.T. teaching.

14. 1 Jo. iv 8, i 5.

et quando spiritus dictus est, non omne id quod est dictus sit; sed ut dum mens hominum intellegendo usque ad ipsum proficit spiritum, conuersa iam ipsa in spiritu aliud quid amplius per spiritum conicere deum esse possit. id enim quod est secundum id quod est, nec humano sermone edici, nec humanis auribus percipi, nec humanis sensibus colligi potest. nam si *quae praeparauit deus his qui diligunt illum, nec oculus uidit, nec auris audiuit, nec cor hominis aut mens ipsa percepit*, qualis et quantus est ille ipse qui haec repromittit, ad quae intellegenda et mens hominis et natura deficit? denique si acceperis spiritum substantiam dei, creaturam feceris deum. omnis enim spiritus creatura est. erit ergo iam factus deus. quomodo et si secundum Moysen ignem acceperis deum, creaturam illum esse dicendo institutum expresseris, non institutorem docueris. sed haec figurantur potius quam ita sunt. nam et in ueteri testamento ideo deus ignis dicitur, ut peccatori populo metus incutiatur, dum iudex ostenditur. et in nouo testamento spiritus esse profertur, ut refector in delictis suis mortuorum per hanc bonitatem collatae credentibus indulgentiae comprobetur.

8 VIII. Hunc ergo, omissis haereticorum fabulis atque

18 refertor γ: effector et creator *coni.* Latin. *unde* refector et creator Pa.: *nos* refector.

3. **conuersa iam ipsa in spiritu**] *v.* Introd. § 5, p. lviii.

4. **id enim quod est**] refers again to Ex. iii 14.

7. 1 Cor. ii 9.

12. **omnis...spiritus creatura**] sc. in the literal sense of the word. Cp. the ambiguity of John iii 8. So Gallandius comments: 'These words do not at all refer to the Holy Spirit. Novatian is shewing that God cannot be designated by man in any word which is not far removed from His infinite majesty. Therefore whether He is called Light or Spirit or Fire, none of these expressions can properly be applied to God. They are figurative, not literal.' According to Pamelius (who also misunderstands the passage), the Pneumatomachi, gratified by this and similar passages, published the Treatise under the name of St Cyprian. See Introd. § 2 i.

ib. **iam**] inferential: 'it follows that...'

13. **ignem**] Deut. iv 24.

14. 'You will have given expression to something made, you will not have set forth the Maker.'

18. **refector**] 'renewer.'

ib. **in delictis..mortuorum**] Eph. ii 1.

VIII. *This is the God whom the Church worships, attested by Nature in all its elements, which*

figmentis, deum nouit et ueneratur ecclesia; cui testimonium reddit tam inuisibilium quam etiam uisibilium et semper et tota natura: quem angeli adorant, astra mirantur, maria benedicunt, terrae uerentur, inferna quaeque suspiciunt: quem mens omnis humana sentit, etiam si non exprimit: cuius imperio omnia commouentur, fontes scaturiunt, amnes labuntur, fluctus assurgunt, fetus suos cuncta parturiunt, uenti spirare coguntur, imbres ueniunt, maria commouentur, fecunditates suas cuncta ubique diffundunt. qui peculiarem protoplastis aeternae uitae mundum quendam paradisum in oriente constituit: *arborem uitae* plantauit; *scientiae boni et mali* similiter alteram arborem collocauit; mandatum dedit; sententiam contra delictum statuit; Noe iustissimum de diluuii periculis pro merito innocentiae fideique seruauit; Enoch transtulit; in amicitiae societatem Abraham allegit; Isaac protexit; Iacob auxit; Moysen ducem populo praefecit; ingemiscentes filios Israel e iugo seruitutis eripuit; legem scripsit; patrum subolem in terram repromissionis induxit; prophetas spiritu instruxit; et per hos omnes filium suum Christum repromisit; et quando daturum se spoponderat, misit. per quem nobis in notitiam uenire uoluit, et in nos indulgentiae suae sinus largos profudit, egenis et abiectis locupletem spiritum

4 quoque *coni.* Ja.

are subject to His power. The relation of God to His chosen people culminates in the Mission of Christ, through whom is the knowledge of God, and in the mission of the Apostles. God's Providence cares for the greatest and the least; He watches over the individual and the community. He sitteth enthroned above the Cherubim. The world itself is His chariot, with angelic guidance and the curb of natural law.

4. **quaeque**] needs no emendation; 'things under the earth, every one.' Cp. p. 25 l. 11 'minima quaeque'; p. 26 l. 2 'ad usque singula quaeque.'

9. 'Who appointed for the peculiar occupation of His first-created a Paradise in the East as a world of eternal life'; Gen. ii 8. 'Protoplastis' is a word of Tertullian's, taken from the Greek of LXX.

11. **arborem uitae**] Gen. ii 9 Vulg.

14. Gen. v 24.

15. Jas. ii 23; Gen. xxii 12; xxx 43, xxxii 10.

16. Ex. iii 9, 10.

20. **per quem** cet.] N. has in view the Marcionites and other heretics, who said that the God revealed in Christ was not the God of the O. T. or of Nature.

22. **sinus largos profudit**]

conferendo. et quia ultro et largus et bonus est, ne totus hic orbis auersus gratiae eius fluminibus aresceret, apostolos institutores generis nostri in totum orbem mitti per filium suum uoluit, ut condicio generis humani agnosceret institutorem, et, si sequi maluisset, haberet quem pro deo in suis iam postulationibus patrem diceret. cuius non prouidentia tantummodo singillatim per homines cucurrit aut currit, sed etiam per ipsas urbes et ciuitates, quarum exitus prophetarum uocibus cecinit; immo etiam per ipsum totum orbem, cuius propter incredulitatem exitus, plagas, deminutiones poenasque descripsit. et ne quis non etiam ad minima quaeque dei putaret istam infatigabilem prouidentiam peruenire, *ex duobus*, inquit dominus, *passeribus unus non cadet sine patris uoluntate, sed et capilli capitis uestri omnes numerati sunt*; cuius etiam cura et prouidentia Israelitarum non siuit *nec uestes consumi*, *nec* uilissima *in pedibus calciamenta deteri*, sed nec ipsorum postremum adulescentium captiua sarabara comburi. nec immerito; nam si hic omnia complexus est *omnia continens*

2 aduersis ms. Wow. *unde fortasse legendum* auersis. 15 siuit *a* : sinit al. 18 omnia continens *a suppleuit.*

'lavished upon us the stores of His kindness.' Cp. n. on p. 3 l. 5.

2. **institutores**] 'instructors': μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη...διδάσκοντες Matt. xxviii 19. Teaching (διδασκαλία Rom. xii 7, διδάσκαλοι 1 Cor. xii 28, Eph. iv 11, 1 Tim. iii 7) stands very high among the functions of the Apostolic Ministry: and naturally if, as S. T. Coleridge said, 'the Christian Faith is the perfection of human intelligence.' Refer to p. 10 l. 1 'institutionem,' with note, for a somewhat different use of the word.

3. Mk xvi 15 Vulg. 'in mundum uniuersum.'

4. 'That the lowly human race might know its Instructor' (or 'Founder'). The expression 'condicio humana' or 'generis humani' is frequent, from Cicero onwards, in the sense of 'human nature under the limitations of frailty.'

5. **si sequi** cet.] Henceforth if they chose to follow Him, they should in prayer address God as their Father, instead of calling Him God (Matt. vi 9). Thus we read in c. xxviii 'quod praemium consecuturus esset, quisquis illum sequi ...uoluisset, ut uidere patrem posset.'

8. **exitus**] 'overthrow,' e.g. Tyre and Babylon.

12. Matt. x 29, 30 Vg. 'super terram sine Patre uestro.'

15. Deut. viii 4 Vg. 'uestimentum tuum...nequaquam uetustate defecit et pes tuus non est subtritus.'

17. **postremum**] 'lastly,' marks the climax: classical 'postremo.'

ib. **sarabara**] (Dan. iii 94 Vulg. sarabala) a Chaldaean word for 'hosen' or Persian breeches: LXX *σαράβαρα*.

18. **omnia continens**] Wisd. i 7: cp. p. 7 l. 3.

(omnia autem et totum ex singulis constant), pertinget consequenter eius ad usque singula quaeque cura, cuius ad totum, quicquid est, peruenit prouidentia.

Hinc est quod et *desuper cherubim sedet*, id est, praeest super operum suorum uarietatem, subiectis throno eius animalibus prae ceteris principatum tenentibus, cuncta *desuper crystallo* contegente, id est, caelo omnia operiente: quod in firmamentum de aquarum fluente materia fuerat deo iubente solidatum, ut glacies robusta aquarum terram pridem contegentium diuidens medietatem dorso quodam pondera aquae superioris, corroboratis de gelu uiribus, sustineret. nam et rotae subiacent, tempora scilicet, quibus omnia semper mundi membra uoluuntur talibus pedibus adiectis, quibus non in perpetuum stant ista, sed transeunt. sed et per omnes artus stellata sunt oculis; dei enim opera peruigili obtutu contemplanda sunt. in quorum sinu carbonum medius est

14 ortus edd. *emend.* We.

2. **ad usque singula quaeque**] 'His care will penetrate to every particular, seeing that His Providence extends to the whole, whatever it be.' The doctrine of a 'particular Providence,' as stated by Novatian, is singularly free (as far as it goes) from anything of an arbitrary or intermittent character. It contemplates man in communities, not in isolation ('per urbes et civitates'); there is a solidarity of created things, and the writer dwells on God's immanence rather than on His transcendence. In the figurative language of prophecy, He is said to be throned above the Cherubim, and at the same time He rides upon the chariot of rolling years and cosmic movements subject to the reign of law, and instinct with a spiritual life, which is spoken of under the image of fire.

4. **desuper cherubim**] Ps. lxxix 1 (lxxx 1) 'qui sedes super cherubim': Ezek. i 26, and below, Ezek. i 22. The whole of the following passage is an interpretation of the vision in Ezek. i. Cf. Dr Sanday's words: 'There is a group of natural phenomena that in Hebrew literature is especially associated with God's presence...phenomena of earthquake and storm...the brilliance of lightning ... the rushing wind ... all expressive of irresistible power....The primitive Hebrew when he saw these things associated directly with them the presence of God.' *Life of Christ in Recent Research* p. 10 f.

8. As all modern commentators explain, the Hebrew word in Gen. i 6 denotes 'expanse' rather than 'firmament.' Cp. Ezek. i 22 (Vulg.); and n. on 'solidamentum,' c. i.

12. **rotae subiacent** cet.] Ezek. x 9, i 19.

15. **stellata sunt oculis**] sc. 'animalia' (the cherubim) or 'Dei opera': see Ezek. x 12 and i 18 Vg. 'totum corpus oculis plenum in circuitu ipsarum': also Apoc. iv 6.

16. 'And in their bosom is fire

ignis; siue quoniam ad igneum diem iudicii mundus iste festinat; siue quoniam omnia opera dei ignea, nec sunt tenebrosa, sed uigent; siue etiam, ne, quia ex terrenis ista fuerant orta principiis, naturaliter de originis suae rigore torperent, addita est omnibus interioris spiritus calida natura, quae frigidis concreta corporibus ad usuram uitae aequalia omnibus libramenta ministraret. hic est igitur currus, secundum Dauid, dei. *currus enim*, inquit, *dei decies milies multiplicatus*, id est, innumerus, infinitus, immensus. sub iugo enim naturalis legis omnibus datae alia quasi frenis reuocata retrahuntur, alia quasi effusis habenis excitata impelluntur. mundum enim istum currum dei cum omnibus et ipsi angeli ducunt et astra; quorum uarios licet meatus, certis tamen legibus uinctos, inspicimus ad metas definiti sibi temporis ducere; ut merito nobis quoque cum apostolo et artificem

3 lucent *coni.* Latin.: luce uigent We. 7 ministraret *coni.* We. monstraret edd. 9 numerus infinitus et immensus G.

of glowing coals in the midst, either because' etc. The passage regards fire as a destructive or penal agency; as a vital principle; as a spiritual principle. See Ezek. i 13, x 7. No emendation of 'uigent' is wanted: it is a favourite word of Novatian, *v.* Introd. p. xix, n. 5.

1. **ad igneum diem**] 2 Pet. iii 12.

5. **spiritus**] Ezek. i 21.

6. **quae frigidis** cet.] 'which mingling with chill bodies might supply all of them with proportionate energies for the exercise of life.' *Libramenta* seems to mean the momentum which each receives in the way of spiritual force, which vitalises brute matter.

8. Ps. lxvii 18 (lxviii 17) 'currus Dei decem milibus multiplex.' In A.V. and R.V. the singular is treated as collective and referred to the angelic host (2 K. vi 17). Here it is regarded as a proper singular.

12. 'For the Angels on their part guide that chariot of His with all His creatures, the world and the stars; and the revolutions of these, complex as they are, yet bound by laws which cannot be broken, we see them conduct to the goal of a time prescribed to them.' Probably *angelos* is subject of *ducere*, recalling the preceding words *angeli ducunt. Et ipsi* (καὶ αὐτοί) means 'as well as the law of nature.' In this picturesque interpretation of O.T. imagery, the charioteer is the Angelic host, the yoke and reins are the laws of nature imposed by the will of God, who rides on the chariot of the Universe and all its parts, sentient or inanimate. 'Lex naturalis' is probably Stoic language. The connexion of Angels with the forces of nature is taught in such passages as Hebr. i 7, Ps. ciii (civ) 4 where πνεύματα means 'winds' (*v.* Bp Westcott *ad loc.*).

et opera mirantibus exclamare iam libeat: *o altitudo diuitiarum sapientiae et scientiae dei, quam inscrutabilia iudicia eius et inuestigabiles uiae eius!* et reliqua.

IX. Eadem regula ueritatis docet nos credere post patrem 9
etiam in filium dei, Christum Iesum, dominum deum nostrum, sed dei filium; huius dei qui et unus et solus est, conditor scilicet rerum omnium, ut iam et superius expressum est. hunc enim Iesum Christum, iterum dicam huius dei filium, et in ueteri testamento legimus esse repromissum et in nouo testamento animaduertimus exhibitum, omnium sacramentorum umbras et figuras de praesentia corporatae ueritatis implentem. hunc enim Abrahae filium, hunc Dauid, non minus et uetera praedicta et euangelia testantur. hunc ipsa Genesis, cum dicit: *tibi dabo et semini tuo;* hunc quando luctatum ostendit hominem cum Iacob; hunc,

13 hunc non minus *edd.*: *fort. legendum* hunc non minus dei.

1. Rom. xi 33 where Vulg. reads *incomprehensibilia.*

THE RULE OF TRUTH. *Second Part.*

IX. *'I believe also in the Son of God, Christ Jesus, our Lord God, but the Son of God.' He was promised in the Old Testament and is revealed in the New Testament incorporating what was shadow and mystery. The Promise traced through Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms.*

5. **'etiam in filium dei, Christum Iesum, dominum deum nostrum'**] Cp. note on ch. i, where the First Article of the Baptismal Creed is given. The close similarity to the Apostles' Creed of the West is evident, especially in the addition of the words 'Dominum nostrum.' This is not to be found in Tertullian's Creeds (as given by Hahn *Symbole*, pp. 2, 3); but Irenaeus (*contr. Haer.* iv 62) has τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν (*ib.*).

6. **sed**] N. wishes to guard the unity of the Godhead ('monarchia').

ib. **huius dei**] controverting Marcion's view that Christ came from 'the good God' Who is distinct from the Demiurge or Creator. May not the word *unus* have formed part of Novatian's Creed, having been preserved here, though omitted in c. i *init.* or perhaps purposely dropped because of its unfamiliarity to later Roman copyists? It answers to *unicus* in Tertullian's creed (*de Virg. Vel.* i, *adu. Prax.* i). See Introd. § 2 iii, p. xxvi.

10. 'Fulfilling the shadows and figures of all types and prophecies in the realised embodiment of the truth.' The meaning of *sacramenta* is not to be restricted: it denotes 'mysteries.' So *de Cib. Iud.* v 'Christus...omnia quae sacramentorum nebulis antiquitas texerat patefaciens.' Cp. p. 5 l. 8 n.

12. 'To Him, the Son of Abraham and Son of David, alike the ancient prophecies and the Gospels bear witness.' We must take *non minus* as equivalent to 'pariter.'

14. Gen. xvii 8.

15. Gen. xxxii 24.

quando dicit: *non deficiet princeps de Iuda, neque dux de femoribus eius, donec ueniat is cui repromissum est, et ipse erit exspectatio gentium.* hunc Moyses, cum dicit: *prouide alium quem mittas;* hunc idem, quando testatur, *prophetam uobis,* dicendo, *suscitabit deus ex fratribus uestris: eum quasi me audite;* hunc, quando dicit: *uidebitis uitam uestram pendentem nocte ac die, et non credetis ei.* hunc Isaias: *prodiet uirga de radice Iesse, et flos de radice eius ascendet;* hunc eundem, quando dicit: *ecce uirgo concipiet et pariet filium;* hunc, quando sanitates ab eo futuras collocat dicens: *tunc aperientur oculi caecorum, et aures surdorum audient: tunc saliet claudus ut ceruus, et diserta erit lingua mutorum;* hunc, quando patientiae uirtutes expromit dicens: *non audietur in plateis uox eius; harundinem quassatam non conteret, et linum fumigans non exstinguet;* hunc, quando eius euangelia descripsit: *et disponam uobis testamentum aeternum, sancta Dauid fidelia;* hunc,

11 clodus *a*.

1. Gen. xlix. 10 Vg. 'non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda et dux de femore eius, donec ueniat qui mittendus est': LXX οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων.

3. Exod. iv 13 Vg. 'mitte quem missurus es.' LXX προχείρισαι δυνάμενον ἄλλον ὃν ἀποστελεῖς.

4. Deut. xviii 15 'prophetam de gente tua et de fratribus tuis sicut me suscitabit tibi dominus deus tuus: ipsum audies.'

6. **uidebitis uitam uestram** cet.] Deut. xxviii 66 Vg. 'et erit uita tua quasi pendens ante te. timebis nocte et die, et non credes uitae tuae.' The early fathers often give this passage a Messianic reference. Thus Iren. *adu. Haer.* iv 20. 2 (Harvey) 'ostenditur pendens in ligno et non credent ei. ait enim "et erit uita tua pendens ante oculos tuos et non credes uitae tuae"': *ib.* v 18. 2, with the comment 'qui igitur non receperunt illum non acceperunt uitam.' Add the newly discovered εἰς Ἔνδειξιν of Irenaeus 79; Tertull. *adu. Iud.* xi; Cypr. *Testim.* ii 20.

7. Is. xi 1 Vg. 'et egredietur uirga de radice Iesse.'

9. Is. vii 14.

10. **sanitates...collocat**] 'brings forward the acts of healing that were to be performed by Him.' Cp. *de Spect.* ii 'cum de stadio sumit exempla, coronae quoque collocat praemia.'

ib. Is. xxxv 5, 6: for 'audient, diserta' Vulg. has 'patebunt, aperta'; LXX ἀκούσονται, τρανή.

12. **patientiae uirtutes**] 'miracles of endurance.'

13. Is. xlii 2, 3: for 'in plateis,' 'harundinem' Vulg. has 'foris, calamum'; LXX ἔξω, κάλαμον.

15. **euangelia descripsit**] 'the Gospels' of the New Testament. A fanciful interpretation of Isaiah lv 3, in which God's 'covenant' with Israel is described, as in Jerem. xxxi 31—33.

16. **sancta Dauid fidelia**] 'the lovingkindnesses of David—the un-

quando gentes in ipsum credituras prophetat: *ecce posui eum in principium et praecipientem gentibus. gentes quae te non nouerunt inuocabunt te, et populi qui te nesciunt ad te confugient;* hunc eundem, quando ad passionem eius exclamat dicens: *sicut ouis ad occisionem ductus est, et sicut agnus coram tondente se sine uoce, sic non aperuit os suum in humilitate*; hunc quando flagrorum eius ictus plagasque descripsit: *liuore eius nos sanati sumus;* aut humilitatem: *et uidimus eum, et non erat ei species neque honor. homo in plaga et sciens ferre infirmitatem*; aut quod populus non erat crediturus: *tota die expandi manus meas ad populum non credentem*; aut quod resurrecturus a mortuis: *et erit in illa die radix Iesse, et qui surget imperare gentibus, in eum gentes sperabunt, et erit requies eius honor*; aut cum tempus resurrectionis: *quasi diluculo paratum inueniemus eum*; aut quod sessurus ad dextram patris: *dixit dominus domino meo: sede ad dexteram meam, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum*; aut cum possessor omnium collocatur: *postula a me, et dabo tibi gentes hereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terrae*; aut quod iudex omnium ostenditur: *deus iudicium tuum regi da, et iustitiam tuam filio*

failing ones,' as Dr Cheyne translates the Hebrew (Is. lv 3). The Vulg. is quite different, reading 'misericordias Dauid fideles.' LXX τὰ ὅσια Δαυεὶδ τὰ πιστά. Refer to n. on p. 10 l. 6.

1. Is. lv 4, 5 (Vulg.) 'ecce testem populis dedi eum, ducem ac praeceptorem gentibus: ecce gentem quam nesciebas uocabis, et gentes quae te non cognouerunt ad te current.' Again the text is nearer to LXX than Vulg.

6. **in humilitate**] the words belong really to the next verse (Is. liii 8): where Cheyne translates 'through oppression.' Vulg. has 'de angustia': LXX ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει.

7. Is. liii 5.

9. **homo in plaga** cet.] Is. liii 3 LXX ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν καὶ εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν, Vulg. 'uirum dolorum et scientem infirmitatem.' Here again N. gives a text which resembles LXX more than Hebr. or Vulg. but does not translate it exactly.

10. Is. lxv 2.

13. **requies eius**] Is. xi. 10 ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῦ LXX: 'sepulcrum eius' Vulg. N. is drawn by the 'surget' to see a prophecy of the Resurrection.

14. Hos. vi 3. Vulg. 'quasi diluculum praeparatus est egressus eius' 'his going forth is as sure as the morning' R.V. But LXX ὡς ὄρθρον ἕτοιμον εὑρήσομεν αὐτόν. Note that here the writer's text diverges even from LXX. N. appears to have forgotten that he began with 'hunc Isaias,' and has mentioned no fresh name.

15. Ps. cix (cx) 1, 2.

18. **collocatur**] 'is represented': cf. p. 29 l. 10 *supra*. Ps. ii 8.

20. Ps. lxxi (lxxii) 1.

regis. nec hoc in loco plura persequar, quae annuntiata de Christo omnibus haereticis sed et ipsis ueritatem tenentibus magis nota sunt.

10 X. Sed illud admoneo, non alterum in euangelio Christum exspectandum fuisse, quam hunc a creatore ueteris testamenti litteris ante promissum; maxime cum et quae de ipso praedicta sunt impleta sint, et quae impleta sunt ante praedicta sint. ut merito haereticorum istorum testamenti ueteris auctoritatem respuentium nescio cui commenticio et ex fabulis anilibus ficto Christo atque fucato possim uere et constanter dicere: "quis es? unde es? a quo missus es? quare nunc uenire uoluisti?

2. 'To all heretics, and even more so to those who hold the truth.' The arrangement of Scriptural proofs from 'the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms' reminds us of Luke xxiv 44.

X. *The heretics posit an imaginary Christ, of whom the O.T. knows nothing. We cannot understand how such a Christ could have come: he would have stood in no intelligible relation to man and the universe. The cult of such a Christ would be blasphemy against the Father; nor could he give man salvation from sin or the hope of resurrection. There is no witness in the Law and Prophets to such a Christ. Why did he wear the semblance if he hated the reality of a body? If he was a phantom, all he did was phantasm too; if he wore only a 'sidereal body,' he is not the Saviour of the human body. But He submitted to the law of death, and exhibited in His own Body the law of resurrection. Not the substance but the guilt of the flesh is excluded from the Kingdom.*

7. 'So that in the face of those heretics who disdain the authority of the Old Testament, I might with justice address their imaginary Christ, the specious creation of old wives' fables, in words of uncompromising truth.' 'Merito' denotes as in pp. 16 l. 6, 49 l. 19 logical necessity or the requirements of consistent statement. 'Haereticorum' to be taken with 'Christo,' as p. 33 l. 5 'eum haereticorum Christum.' The heretics whom this chapter refutes are the Docetae (especially Marcion and his follower Apelles), and the Gnostics. Marcion drew a sharp contrast between the Old and New Testaments, rejecting the former in a rationalistic spirit (cp. l. 8 'testamenti ueteris auctoritatem respuentium'). The Gnostics did not deny but allegorised the O.T.

9. **commenticio** cet.] Both Docetae and Gnostics distinguished the Heavenly Christ from the man Jesus; they 'evaded the Incarnation because of its real contact with matter.' Of Marcion Tertullian says (*de Carne Christi* i) 'qui carnem Christi putatiuam introduxit, aeque potuit natiuitatem quoque phantasma confingere.' The Syrian Gnostics also taught that the whole visible appearance of Christ was a phantom, and denied His birth. (Consult R. L. Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation* i 180, 181: Harnack *D.G.*[3] i 247 n. 263; Tixeront *Hist. des Dogmes* pp. 196, 203.) Cp. 1 Tim. iv 7.

11. **quare nunc uenire uoluisti?**] 'why at this particular time?' a reference to the suddenness of the descent of the heavenly Christ ac-

quare talis? uel qua uenire potuisti? uel quare non ad tuos abisti, nisi quod probasti tuos non habere, dum ad alienos uenis? quid tibi cum mundo creatoris? quid tibi cum homine conditoris? quid tibi cum figmento corporis, cui eripis spem resurrectionis? quid ad alienum uenis famulum, alienum sollicitare desideras filium? quid me a domino eripere conaris? quid me in patrem blasphemare atque impium esse compellis? aut quid sum a te in resurrectione consecuturus, qui me ipsum non recipio, dum corpus amitto? si saluare uis, fecisses hominem cui salutem dares. si a delicto eripere cupis, ante mihi ne delinquerem contulisses. quod autem tecum suffragium circumfers legis? quod habes testimonium propheticae uocis? aut quid mihi possum de te solidum repromittere, cum te uideam in phantasmate et non in soliditate uenisse? quid ergo tibi cum figura corporis, si corpus odisti? immo reuinceris corporis quod odisti circumferre substantiam, cuius suscipere uoluisti etiam figuram: odisse enim debueras corporis imitationem, si oderas ueritatem. quoniam si alter es, aliter uenire

cording to Marcion: cp. Tertull. *adu. Marc.* iv 11 'subito Christus, subito et Ioannes: sic sunt omnia apud Marcionem.'

1. **qua uenire potuisti**] 'by what way?'

2. **nisi quod probasti**] 'Nisi quod' and 'nisi quoniam,' like the classical 'nisi forte,' append the true alternative: 'but the real truth is that etc.'

3. **cum homine c.**] 'with man, the Maker's work: with a makebelieve body': *v. infra* p. 33 ll. 10—15.

5. **alienum famulum**] Cp. 'alienum seruum' Rom. xiv 4.

8. **qui me ipsum non recipio**] 'in that I do not recover myself (my personal identity) in losing my body.' The hope of a bodily resurrection is clearly bound up with the bodily Resurrection of the Lord in the mind of all primitive Christians.

9. 'If you wish to save, you ought to have made a man to whom to give salvation.' 'Fecisses,' 'past jussive' subjunctive, as sometimes in Cicero: so in next sentence, 'you should have bestowed on me in advance an immunity against sinning.' A Docetic Christ could not have either suffered for our sins, or risen in the flesh for the promise of our immortality.

11. **suffragium**] = suffragationem, 'support.'

15. **figura**] 'the outward form.' St Paul's σχῆμα ὡς ἄνθρωπος (Phil. ii 7, where however the μορφὴ δούλου is also attributed to Christ).

ib. **reuinceris**] 'art proved': if the true Christ hated the reality of a body, He would have hated even its semblance. The argument turns on His being Himself the Truth. Jackson quotes Tertull. *adu. Marc.* iii 10 'cur enim non in aliqua alia digniore substantia uenit, et in primis sua, ne et indigna et aliena uideretur eguisse?'

debueras, ne dicereris filius creatoris, si uel imaginem habuisses carnis et corporis. certe si oderas natiuitatem, quia creatoris oderas nuptiarum coniunctionem, recusare debueras etiam imitationem hominis, qui per nuptias nascitur creatoris." neque igitur eum haereticorum agnoscimus Christum, qui in imagine (ut dicitur) fuit et non in ueritate:—nihil enim uerum eorum quae gessit fecerit, si ipse phantasma et non ueritas fuit:—neque eum, qui nihil in se nostri corporis gessit, dum ex Maria nihil accepit, ne non nobis uenerit, dum non in nostra substantia uisus apparuit: neque illum, qui aethereum siue sideream, ut alii uoluerunt haeretici, induit carnem; nullam in illo nostro intellegamus salutem, si non etiam nostri corporis cognoscamus soliditatem: nec ullum omnino alterum, qui quoduis aliud ex figmento haereticorum gesserit corpus fabularium. omnes enim istos et natiuitas domini et mors ipsa confutat. nam et *uerbum*, inquit Ioannes, *caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis*; ut merito corpus nostrum in illo fuerit, quoniam quidem nostram carnem sermo suscepit. et sanguis

9 ne non] neque Latin.: neque enim Ja. 11 induit] uoluit edd. ne ullam *mendose* Mign. 12 nostram γ We.: -ae Ja. 15 fabularum γ Pa: fabularium *coni.* F. Jun.

3. **creatoris ... nuptiarum coniunctionem**] 'the Creator's ordinance of marriage.'

8. 'And we do not recognise such a Christ as bore within Himself nothing of our body, having received nothing from Mary, for fear lest He may not have come to us at all, in that He did not present Himself in our own substance when He appeared.'

11. **alii haeretici**] e.g. the Syrian Gnostics Satornilus and others. Ammundsen (*Novatianus* p. 37) supposes that the heretic referred to is Apelles, who, according to Tertull. *de Carn.* vi 8, attributed a sidereal body to Christ. See Hauck's *Realenc.* xii p. 274, also Tertull. *de Praescr.* li.

ib. **nullam in illo** cet.] 'We should see no salvation even in our own Christ, if we did not recognise also [in Him] the solid substance of our own body.'

ib. **induit**] The editors have 'uoluit,' which seems impossible after 'uoluerunt,' as Fr. Junius felt when he explained it 'a uoluendo non a uolendo.'

14. **corpus fabularium**] σῶμα μυθῶδες: see crit. note. For the form cp. 'singularius, ollarius.'

16. **uerbum...sermo**] "As early as the second century Sermo and Verbum were rival translations of the Greek term Λόγος. Tertullian gives both, but seems himself to prefer 'Ratio.' 'Sermo' first became unusual, and finally was disallowed in the Latin Church," Plummer on St John i 1. On the Logos-Doc-

idcirco de manibus ac pedibus atque ipso latere demanauit, ut nostri consors corporis probaretur, dum occasus nostri legibus moritur. qui dum in eadem substantia corporis, in qua moritur, resuscitatus ipsius corporis uulneribus comprobatur, etiam resurrectionis nostrae leges in sua carne monstrauit, qui corpus, quod ex nobis habuit, in sua resurrectione restituit. lex enim resurrectionis ponitur, dum Christus ad exemplum ceterorum in substantia corporis suscitatur. quoniam, cum *caro et sanguis non obtinere regnum dei* scribitur, non carnis substantia damnata est, quae diuinis manibus, ne periret, exstructa est; sed sola carnis culpa merito reprehensa est, quae uoluntaria hominis temeritate contra legis diuinae iura grassata est. qua in baptismate et in mortis dissolutione sublata caro ad salutem

12 qua] quia *edd.*: *cf.* p. 64 l. 14.

trine *v.* Sanday *Criticism of Fourth Gospel* Lect. vi and esp. also p. 244 'In the writers of the next generation to Ignatius—e.g. in Justin—the conception of the Logos is infected by Greek philosophy, giving to it more or less the sense of reason, whereas in Ignatius the leading idea is, as we have seen it to be in St John, that of revelation': and again (*ib.* 193) 'the Divine Word, Divine utterance, creative, energizing, revealing.' In the O.T. the Word of the Lord denotes the word spoken in power, and that only. Cf. Ps. xxxii (xxxiii) 6, cvi (cvii) 20, Is. xl 8: and Prof. Inge, *Personal Idealism* ii.

2. **dum occasus nostri legibus moritur**] 'in dying under the laws of our (human) dissolution': a quasi-causal use of 'dum' which is frequent in N. Here, as in 'resurrectionis nostrae leges,' we must not think of the modern use of 'law' as simply denoting an 'invariable sequence or concomitance,' nor of the Pauline 'law of sin and death.' The writer merely means the conditions (especially corporeal) of death.

8. **caro et s.** cet.] 1 Cor. xv 50, where Vg. has 'possidere.'

9. **non carnis substantia damnata est**] In view of the Gnostic disparagement of matter, N. explains that the Bible pronounces no condemnation of 'flesh' in the natural sense of the word; it is only the sinfulness of the flesh ('sola carnis culpa') which is condemned and put away ('sublata': compare Rom. xi. 6 'ut destruatur corpus peccati'). It is by the process begun in baptism and completed by the beneficent action of death that the flesh is purified and is restored to the state of innocence.

12. **qua in baptismate** cet.] The simple correction of 'quia' to 'qua' relieves us of the necessity of understanding 'caro' in a double sense, as 'taken away' in baptism and death in order to 'return to salvation.'

13. **ad salutem reuertitur**] the positive result of Baptism is described in Tertull. *de Bapt.* v 'ita restituetur homo Deo ad similitudinem eius qui retro ad imaginem Dei fuerat.'

reuertitur, dum ad statum innocentiae, deposita criminis mortalitate, reuocatur.

11 XI. Verum ne ex hoc quod dominum nostrum Iesum Christum dei creatoris filium in substantia ueri corporis exhibitum asserimus, aliis haereticis hoc in loco hominem tantum et solum defendentibus, atque ideo hominem illum nudum et solitarium probare cupientibus, aut manus dedisse aut loquendi materiam commodasse uideamur, non sic de substantia corporis ipsius exprimimus, ut solum et tantum hominem illum esse dicamus; sed ut diuinitate sermonis in ipsa concretione permixta etiam deum illum secundum scripturas esse teneamus. est enim periculum grande, saluatorem generis humani, totius dominum et principem mundi, cui a suo patre omnia tradita sunt et cuncta concessa, per quem instituta sunt

9 solum tantum edd.: et *ins.* Ja.

1. **criminis mortalitate**] 'the death of sin.'

XI. *But we do not dwell on the Manhood to the exclusion of the Godhead. As Christ is Very Man and not only God, so He is Very God and not mere man. He is Lord of the universe, to whom all things have been committed by the Father, and before whom nothing is except the Father. To deny His Godhead is to dishonour the Father.*

The heretics only see one side of the truth, the human infirmities, not the Divine powers. On the one side are His sufferings, on the other His mighty works. If the latter do not prove His Godhead, no more can the former prove His Manhood. The proof of both is found in Scripture.

He who is of God is God, He who is of man is man. The two Natures in the Person of Christ are contrasted at some length. His limitations prove human weakness; His majestic attributes, Divine power. There is a danger of oversetting the rule of Faith by a one-sided assent to correlative truths.

5. **aliis haereticis**] The reference is to the 'Adoptianists,' who held that in Christ is the virtue (δύναμις) but not the essence (οὐσία) of the Godhead. See Introd. § 3 p. xxx.

ib. **hoc in loco**] 'on this topic,' i.e. 'in this connexion.'

7. **nudum et solitarium**] merely repeats the idea of bare manhood. *Manus dedisse* etc. 'to have capitulated to them or allowed them the foundation of an argument.'

10. 'As the Divinity of the Word enters into the union of the Natures.' For 'concretio' cp. p. 18. 7 'sine ulla corporea concretione,' 'admixture,' p. 27. 5 'spiritus calida natura frigidis concreta corporibus,' 'united' or 'amalgamated with': Cic. *N. D.* i 71 says of Epicurus 'in natura deorum...indiuiduorum corporum concretionem fugit,' 'an aggregation of indivisible particles.' Thus the root idea is of two or more elements growing into one. Later theologians preferred the terms *unitio*, *commixtio*, σύγκρασις, μῖξις. See Petavius *de Incarn.* iii 2.

uniuersa, creata sunt tota, digesta sunt cuncta, aeuorum omnium et temporum regem, angelorum omnium principem, ante quem nihil praeter patrem, hominem tantummodo dicere et auctoritatem illi diuinam in his abnegare. haec enim contumelia haereticorum ad ipsum quoque deum patrem redundabit, si deus pater filium deum generare non potuit. sed enim ueritati caecitas haereticorum nulla praescribet, nec quoniam in Christo aliquid tenent, aliquid non tenent, alterum uident, alterum non uident, eripietur nobis illud quod non uident, per illud quod uident. quasi hominis enim in illo fragilitates considerant, quasi dei uirtutes non computant; infirmitates carnis recolunt, potestates diuinitatis excludunt. quando si probatio haec ex infirmitatibus Christi illuc proficit, ut homo ex infirmitatibus comprobetur, probatio diuinitatis in illo collecta ex uirtutibus illuc proficiet, ut etiam deus ex operibus asseratur. si enim passiones ostendunt in illo humanam fragilitatem, cur opera non asserant in illo diuinam potestatem? ne, si hoc non profecerit ut deus ex uirtutibus asseratur, nec passiones proficiant ut etiam homo

1. **tota**] In Latin of this date the plural of *totus* is on its way to become the *tutti todos* and *tous* of the Romance languages. See Rönsch *Itala u. Vulgata* p. 338.

ib. **aeuorum ... regem**] Cp. 1 Tim. i. 17, Rev. xv 3.

3. **ante quem**] The writer probably refers to His origination from the Father before all time. On this question cp. xxxi, p. 117 ll. 2 sq. 'semper autem...originem nescit,' and notes on that chapter.

4. **in his**] refers to the 'omnia' of p. 35. 14.

7. **praescribet**] 'shall lay down the law for,' as below, p. 37. 14. It may, however, be taken in the special sense 'enter a preliminary objection,' as in Tertullian's 'praescriptio haereticorum': then translate 'shall set limits to.'

10. **quasi hominis...quasi dei**] each practically one word, 'the frailties of a man,' 'the powers of a God.'

12. **recolunt**] 'reflect upon,' 'recollect': *excludunt*, sc. 'mente sua.'

14. **illuc proficit ut...comprobetur**] 'avails to prove Him.'

18. **ne si...**] lit. 'for fear lest': i.e. 'for otherwise neither will His sufferings avail' etc. In other words: you may as reasonably question the true Humanity as the true Divinity: each rests on the same sort of evidence, the 'opera' and the 'passiones' of the historical Christ. For (p. 37. 1) 'whatever principle is established in the case of either thesis, will be found to have been accepted in the other.' In the Scripture account the Godhead is as unmistakable as the Manhood. It is significant that the writer finds it just as hard to doubt the one as to doubt the other.

ex ipsis esse monstretur. quaecumque enim lex in alterutro fuerit posita, in altero inuenietur esse suscepta. periculum enim erit nec hominem illum ex passionibus ostendi, si non potuerit etiam deus ex uirtutibus approbari. non est ergo in unam partem inclinandum et ab alia parte fugiendum, quoniam nec tenebit perfectam ueritatem quisquis aliquam ueritatis exclu-serit portionem. tam enim scriptura etiam deum annuntiat Christum, quam etiam hominem ipsum annuntiat deum; tam hominem descripsit Iesum Christum, quam etiam deum quoque descripsit Christum dominum. quoniam nec dei tantum illum filium esse proponit, sed et hominis; nec hominis tantum dicit, sed et dei referre consueuit: ut dum ex utroque est, utrumque sit; ne si alterum tantum sit, alterum esse non possit. ut enim praescripsit ipsa natura hominem credendum esse, qui ex homine sit, ita eadem natura praescribit et deum credendum esse, qui ex deo sit: ne si non et deus fuerit, cum ex deo sit, iam nec homo sit, licet ex homine fuerit, et sic in alterutro utrumque periclitetur, dum alterum altero fidem perdidisse conuincitur. qui legunt ergo hominis filium hominem Christum Iesum, legant hunc eundem et deum et dei filium

1 ex ipsis *a*: ab i. *al*. 2 in altero *om*. Migne. suspecta *γ*, *al*.: *corr*. We. 17 sic G: *om*. *γ*.

12. **sed et dei referre consueuit**] 'but is also wont to call Him the Son of God.'

16. **qui ex deo sit**] See Westcott on John viii 42. The expression was used by Ign. *Eph*. vii 2 *καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ*; by Justin *Dial*. 61 *θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ πεφυκὼς ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*; by Hippolytus *c. Noet*. xi *πάντα τοίνυν δι' αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς δὲ μόνος ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*; and by Tertullian (e.g. *Apol*. 21 'ex deo prolatum didicimus'; *adu. Prax*. 11 'filius non erit alius quam qui ex ipso prodiit, sermo autem prodiit ex ipso'). It was taken up by the Fathers of Nicaea, *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ*. The Creed of the Arians, called that of Sirmium, has the formula *γεγεννημένον μονογενῆ μόνον ἐκ μόνου ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρός, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὅμοιον τῷ γεννήσαντι αὐτὸν πατρὶ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* (Hahn, *Symb*. p. 124): where one observes that the term *θ. ἐκ θεοῦ* is evacuated of its full meaning by its context.

ib. **ne si non et deus**] 'otherwise, if He should be found not to be God, when He is of God, it follows He is not man either, although He be of man, and thus in either nature both are at stake, the one being proved to have been discredited by [the overthrow of] the other.'

19. **hominem Chr. Iesum**] 1 Tim. ii 5.

nuncupatum. nam quo modo est, qua homo, ex Abraham, sic est etiam, qua deus, *ante* ipsum *Abraham*. et quo modo, qua homo, *filius Dauid*, ita *dominus* Dauid, qua deus, nuncupatus est. et quo modo, qua homo, *sub lege factus* est, ita, qua deus, *sabbati dominus* expressus est. et quo modo, qua homo, sententiam patitur, sic omne, qua deus, de uiuis et mortuis iudicium habere reperitur. et quo modo post mundum, qua homo, nascitur, sic ante mundum, qua deus, fuisse perhibetur. et quo modo *ex semine Dauid*, qua homo, genitus est, sic item *per ipsum*, qua deum, *mundus* dicitur institutus. et quo modo, qua homo, post multos, sic, qua deus, ante omnes; et quo modo ceteris, qua homo, inferior, sic omnibus, qua deus, maior. et quo modo in caelum, qua homo, ascendit, sic inde, qua deus, ante descendit; et quo modo *ad patrem*, qua homo, *uadit*, sic oboediens patri, qua filius, inde descensurus est. ita si mediocritates in illo approbant humanam fragilitatem, maiestates in illo affirmant diuinam potestatem. periculum est enim, cum utrumque legis, non utrumque sed alterum credidisse. ex quo quoniam utrumque in Christo legitur, utrumque creditur, ut fides ita demum uera sit, si et perfecta fuerit. nam si ex duobus, altero in fide cessante, unum, et quidem id quod est minus, ad credendum

1 quo modo Ja.: quomodo edd. Cf. p. 8. 16. 10 ita γ, *al.*: item We.: etiam Ja.

2. **ante ipsum Abraham**] John viii 58.

3—5. Matt. xx 31, Gal. iv 4, Luke vi 5. N. ignores the fact that the prerogative is expressly assigned to Christ as the 'Son of Man'; and the same may be said of the future Judgment (John v 27).

6. John v 21, 22: 'uenturum iudicare uiuos et mortuos' Creed of Tertullian (*adu. Prax.* i) and Roman Creed.

7—12. John xvii 5, Rom. i 3, John i 10, Acts x 36.

12. **ceteris**] 'other men,' Is. liii 3: 'omnibus,' 'all beings' or even 'all things.' We may cp. p. 58. 14 'omnia,' 16 'et Ioannes et ceteri.'

13, 14. John vi 63, xiv 28.

16. **mediocritates**] 'limitations': cp. 'populi mediocris est sensus,' p. 20 l. 9 with ref.

19. **alterum**] = 'alterutrum': so *de Cib. Iud.* iii 'aut utrumque...aut alterum...aut neutrum.'

21. 'For if, of the two principles, the one comes short of acceptance, while the other, and that the less important, is embraced in belief, the rule of truth is thereby overset, and such presumption will not be found to have brought salvation, but in place thereof to have entailed

fuerit assumptum, perturbata regula ueritatis, temeritas ista non salutem contulerit, sed in uicem salutis de iactura fidei periculum mortis grande conflauerit.

12 XII. Cur ergo dubitemus dicere, quod scriptura non dubitat exprimere? cur haesitabit fidei ueritas, in quo scripturae numquam haesitauit auctoritas? ecce enim Osee prophetes ait ex persona patris: *iam non saluabo eos in arcu, neque in equis, neque in equitibus; sed saluabo eos in domino deo ipsorum.* si deus saluare se dicit in deo, non autem saluat nisi in Christo deus, cur ergo homo dubitet Christum deum dicere, quem deum a patre animaduertit positum per scripturas esse? immo si non saluat nisi in deo pater deus, saluari non poterit a deo patre quisquam, nisi confessus fuerit Christum deum, in quo se et per quem se repromittit pater salutem daturum; ut merito quisquis illum agnoscit esse deum, salutem inueniat in deo Christo; quisquis non recognoscit esse deum, salutem perdiderit, quoniam alibi nisi in Christo deo eam inuenire non poterit.

Quo modo enim Isaias: *ecce uirgo concipiet et pariet filium, et uocabitis nomen eius Emmanuel,* quod interpretatum est *nobiscum deus,* sic Christus ipse dicit: *ecce ego uobiscum sum usque ad consummationem saeculi.* est ergo nobiscum

16 esse deum G Pa.: et deum *al.* 17 quoniam...eam inuenire γ We.: quam...inuenire G. Pa.

a serious peril of the death of the soul from the loss of the faith.' 'Iactura,' properly the jettison of cargo, implies a 'wilful and deliberate loss.'

XII. *Old Testament proofs of the Godhead of Christ. The signs of healing, if they do not prove Christ the Son of God, must prove Him to be the Father. It is enough for our present purpose that they prove Him to be God. The prophecy that 'God shall come from the South' can only refer to Christ, and if these heretics deny this, they must, with the Sabellians, identify Christ with the Father who cannot be limited by space. But it must point to His birth at Bethlehem, and in that case asserts His Godhead. In either case, Christ cannot be mere Man.*

6. Hos. i 7.

13. **nisi confessus fuerit...**] The argument advances here *per saltum,* although the writer might have supplied the missing step by reference to Rom. x 9, 1 John iv 3.

14. **in quo se et per quem...**] This is so often asserted in the N.T. that Novatian does not quote in support such passages as Acts iv 12.

19. Is. vii 14. Vulg. reads 'uocabitur.'

20. Matt. xxviii 20.

deus, immo multo magis etiam in nobis est. nobiscum est Christus: est ergo cuius nomen est *nobiscum deus*, quia et nobiscum est. aut numquid non est nobiscum? quo modo ergo dicit se nobiscum esse? est ergo nobiscum: sed quoniam nobiscum est, Emmanuel, id est, *nobiscum deus*, dictus est. deus ergo quia nobiscum est, *nobiscum deus* dictus est. idem prophetes: *conualescite, manus dissolutae, et genua debilia; consolamini pusillanimes sensu, conualescite, nolite timere: ecce deus noster iudicium retribuet: ipse ueniet et saluabit nos: tunc aperientur oculi caecorum, et aures surdorum audient; tunc saliet claudus sicut ceruus, et diserta erit lingua mutorum.* si in aduentu dei dicit prophetes haec futura signa, quae facta sunt, aut dei filium agnoscant Christum, in cuius aduentu et a quo haec sanitatum signa facta sunt: aut diuinitatis Christi ueritate superati, in alteram haeresim ruentes, Christum dum filium dei et deum confiteri nolunt, patrem illum esse confiteantur. uocibus enim prophetarum inclusi iam Christum deum negare non possunt. quid ergo respondent, cum in aduentu dei haec signa futura dicuntur, quae in aduentu Christi gesta sunt? Christum qualiter accipiunt deum (deum enim iam negare non possunt), qua patrem aut qua filium? si qua filium, cur dei filium deum negant? si qua patrem, cur eos non sequuntur, qui eiusmodi blasphemias tenere uidentur? nisi quoniam nobis in hoc aduersus illos de ueritate certamine hoc interim sufficit, ut quocumque genere conuicti Christum confiteantur et deum, quem etiam deum negare uoluerunt.

11 si α: sin *al.* 16 confiteantur We. Ja.: -ebuntur *priores.* 20 accip. deum Pa. *secutus* α: accip. dominum *al.*

7. **conualescite** cet.] Is. xxxv 3—6. The LXX here differs from the Vulg.: e.g. 'consolamini' represents παρακαλέσατε where Vulg. has 'dicite pusillanimis, Confortamini.'

14. **sanitatum**] 'cures'; so p. 29 l. 10.

15. **alteram haeresim**] refers to the Sabellian heresy: see Introd. § 3 p. xxx.

16. One would rather expect 'profiteantur,' of what is a heretical assertion.

23. 'Unless it be that, in this contention with them about the truth, it is enough for our present purpose that, no matter how they are refuted, they should confess that Christ is also God; for this is what they wished to deny.' That is to say: do as they will, these doubters cannot help being inconsistent. For

Per Habacuc prophetam ait: *deus ab Africo ueniet et sanctus de monte opaco et condenso.* quem uolunt isti ab Africo uenire? si uenisse aiunt omnipotentem deum patrem, ergo de loco deus pater uenit, ex quo etiam loco cluditur, et intra sedis alicuius angustias continetur; et iam per istos, ut diximus, Sabelliana haeresis sacrilega corporatur, siquidem Christus non filius sed pater creditur: et nouo more, dum ab istis districte homo nudus asseritur, per eos rursum Christus pater deus omnipotens comprobatur. at si in Bethlehem, cuius metaturae regio ad meridianam respicit plagam caeli, Christus nascitur, qui per scripturas et deus dicitur, merito deus hic ab Africo uenire describitur, quia a Bethlehem uenturus esse praeuidebatur. eligant ergo ex duobus quid uelint hunc, qui ab Africo uenit,—filium esse, an patrem: deus enim dicitur ab Africo uenturus. si filium, quid dubitant Christum et deum dicere? deum enim scriptura dicit esse uenturum. si patrem, quid dubitant cum Sabellii temeritate misceri, qui Christum patrem dicit? nisi quoniam, siue illum patrem siue filium dixerint,

nisi quoniam see n. on x 2: but in this case it corrects the preceding implication (that the heretics will not choose) under the form of an exception: 'but the truth is that they admit His Godhead.' For this use of *interim*, 'for the time being,' cp. xv 10.

1. Hab. iii 3 Vulg. 'Deus ab austro ueniet et Sanctus de monte Pharan.' R.V. has 'God came [*marg.* cometh] from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran.' The argument that follows implies that every 'anthropopathic' passage of the O.T. refers to God the Son. It will be observed that N. sees no difficulty in submitting the Godhead of the Son to limitations from which the Father is exempt. See Introd. § 5.

4. **ex quo** cet.] 'and in consequence is included in space.' Edd. have 'cluditur': the form is frequent in Tertullian and the African writers, and belongs doubtless to popular diction. See Rönsch *Itala u. Vulgata* p. 465.

6. The reference to Sabellius helps to fix the date of the Treatise: *v.* Introd. § 2, ii.

ib. **corporatur**] 'is embodied': i.e. they represent it.

7. **districte**] 'rigidly.' Translate 'it is strange how those heretics, while insisting upon the mere Humanity, are found on the other hand proving Christ to be the Father, God Almighty.' Note that 'eos' refers to the same persons as 'istis': perhaps 'eosdem' should be read.

9. 'In Bethlehem which in its geographical aspect faces towards the South': lit. 'the direction of whose measuring.' Bethlehem is of course S.W. of Jerusalem.

18. **nisi quoniam**] 'except that, whether they call Him the Father or the Son, they are bound, though

ab haeresi sua inuiti licet desciscant necesse est, qui Christum hominem tantummodo solent dicere, dum illum, rebus ipsis coacti, deum incipiunt promere, siue dum illum patrem, siue dum illum filium uoluerint nuncupare.

XIII. Ac sic et Ioannes natiuitatem Christi describens, 13
uerbum, inquit, *caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis, et uidimus claritatem eius, claritatem tamquam unigeniti a patre, plenum gratia et ueritate.* nam et *uocatur nomen eius uerbum dei*: nec immerito. *eructauit*, inquit, *cor meum uerbum bonum*; quod uerbum regis nomine consequenter appellat inferendo, *dico ego opera mea regi. per ipsum* enim *omnia facta sunt* opera, *et sine ipso factum est nihil. siue enim*, inquit apostolus, *throni, siue dominationes, siue uirtutes, siue potestates, uisibilia et inuisibilia, omnia per ipsum constant.* uerbum autem hoc

reluctantly, to abandon their own heresy of saying that Christ is mere man: the logic of facts compels them to affirm His Godhead, whether they choose to call Him the Father or the Son.' See n. *supra*, p. 40. 23 on 'nisi quoniam.'

XIII. *The same faith is established by the N.T. He is the Word of God who was made Flesh, for by Him the worlds were made. Christ then is both God and Man: in His nativity both natures met. The Son of God descended to earth and the Son of Man ascended to heaven; and so, after the bridal union with flesh, returned to the glory which He had with the Father before the world was. Thus the glory and the authority of His Divinity are ratified. He is God, because He reads the secrets of the heart, forgives sins, descends from heaven, can say 'I and the Father are one* [*substance*],' *receives the testimony of SS. Thomas and Paul. Finally, all things were made by Him: therefore He is before all things: therefore He is God. If He were mere man, nothing would be 'through Him,' which would contradict Scripture.*

7. **claritatem**] John i 14 Vulg. 'gloriam.'

8. Apoc. xix 13.

9. **eructauit** cet.] Ps. xliv (xlv) 1 quoted by Tertull. *adu. Prax.* vii, xi reading 'sermonem optimum.'

10. 'The word which directly after He calls by the name of King, when he adds "I tell My works to the King."' A difficult piece of exegesis: the mighty universe ('opera mea') was a thought in the mind of God; the work of creation was God's utterance to the Creator Word, who was Himself addressed in the utterance.

ib. **appellat inferendo**] 'Inferre' is here used, like εἰσάγειν in Greek, for 'to mention,' 'speak of,' 'say.' Cp. *infra* p. 69. 8 'ipse angelus infert dicens.' It is so used by Tertullian; e.g. *adu. Prax.* 18 'nominatur igitur unus deus pater, et alius absque eo non est. quod ipse inferens non filium negat, sed deum alium.'

11. John i 3. See Westcott ('additional note' *ad loc.*).

13. Coloss. i 16 Vulg. 'uisibilia et inuisibilia: siue throni siue dominationes siue principatus siue potestates: omnia per ipsum.'

illud est, quod *in sua uenit, et sui eum non receperunt. mundus* enim *per ipsum factus est, et mundus eum non cognouit. uerbum* autem hoc *erat in principio apud deum, et deus erat uerbum.* quis igitur dubitet, cum in extrema parte dicitur, *uerbum caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis*, Christum, cuius est natiuitas, et quia caro factus est, esse hominem, et quia uerbum dei, deum incunctanter edicere esse; praesertim cum animaduertat scripturam euangelicam utramque istam substantiam in unam natiuitatis Christi foederasse concordiam?

Hic est enim qui *sicut sponsus egreditur de thalamo suo, exsultauit ut gigas ad currendum uiam; a summo caelo egressio eius et usque ad summum regressio eius.* quoniam usque ad summum, *nec quisquam in caelum ascendit, nisi qui de caelo descendit, filius hominis, qui est in caelis*, repetens hoc ipsum dicit: *pater, clarifica me eo honore quo fui apud te antequam mundus esset.* ac si de caelo descendit uerbum hoc tamquam

6 quia...et quia] qua...et qua Latin.

1. John i 10, 11 Vulg. 'in propria uenit.'

2. John i 1, 2.

4. 'Who can hesitate to say upon the moment that Christ...is Man and...God?'

8. **utramque istam...**] 'has associated both natures in the one harmony of Christ's nativity.' The phrase *utraque substantia*, which is used by Tertullian, appears to come originally from Melito: see Loofs in Hauck-Herzog *Realenc.* iv 36. The 'union of the two natures' is expressed variously in the Treatise by the words 'concordia,' 'permixtio' (xi), 'contextus,' 'concretus,' 'ex utroque conexus' (xxiv), 'communio substantiae' (xxxi *fin.*), 'Verbi et carnis coniunctio' (xiv), 'Deus cum homine copulatus' (xv, xxiii), 'confibulare' (xxiii).

10. **sicut sponsus**] The mystical application of Ps. xviii (xix) to the Incarnation is very ancient. It is found in Iren. *adu. Haer.* iv 55. 4 and εἰς Ἐπιδ. 85, and yet earlier in Justin *Apol.* i 54, *Dial.* 64, 69. See also Tert. *adu. Marc.* iv 11, and Cypr. *Test.* ii 19. But the best known instance is found in Ambrose's Hymn 'Veni, Redemptor gentium'

'Procedit e thalamo suo,
pudoris aula regia,
geminae gigas substantiae
alacris ut currat uiam.
egressus eius a Patre,
regressus eius ad Patrem.'

Of course the application rests in part upon a misunderstanding of *ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*.

12. **quoniam usque ad summum**] sc. 'regreditur,' with which 'nec quisquam ... ascendit' is coupled, 'and because' etc. The reference is to John iii 13.

15. **honore**] John xvii 5 Vulg. 'claritate.'

16. **ac si de caelo** cet.] 'If this Word descended from heaven as a bridegroom to the flesh, in order that, by assuming flesh, He might as Son of Man ascend thither, whence He had descended as the

sponsus ad carnem, ut per carnis assumptionem filius hominis illuc posset ascendere, unde dei filius uerbum descenderat, merito, dum per conexionem mutuam et caro uerbum dei gerit et filius dei fragilitatem carnis assumit, cum sponsa carne conscendens illuc, unde sine carne descenderat, recipit iam claritatem illam, quam dum ante mundi institutionem habuisse ostenditur, deus manifestissime comprobatur. et nihilominus, dum mundus ipse post illum institutus refertur, per ipsum creatus esse reperitur; quo ipso diuinitatis in ipso, per quem factus est mundus, et claritas et auctoritas comprobetur.

Quod si, cum nullius sit nisi dei cordis nosse secreta, Christus secreta conspicit cordis: quod si, cum nullius sit nisi dei peccata dimittere, idem Christus peccata dimittit: quod si, cum nullius sit hominis de caelo uenire, de caelo ueniendo descendit: quod si, cum nullius hominis haec uox esse possit, *ego et pater unum sumus*, hanc uocem de conscientia diuinitatis Christus solus edicit: quod si postremo omnibus diuinitatis Christi probationibus et rebus instructus apostolus Thomas, respondens Christo *dominus meus et deus meus* dicit: quod si et apostolus Paulus, *quorum*, inquit, *patres et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia deus benedictus in saecula*, in suis litteris scribit: quod si idem se *apostolum non ab hominibus, aut per hominem, sed per Iesum Christum* constitutum esse depromit: quod si idem euangelium non se *ab hominibus didicisse aut per hominem, sed per Iesum Christum* accepisse contendit: merito deus est Christus.

Son of God, the Word—since by a mutual nexus flesh wears the Word of God, and the Son of God assumes frail flesh—ascending with the flesh which He had wedded to that place whence without flesh He had descended, of necessity He resumes the glory,' etc. For 'merito' of logical consequence cp. p. 45. 3 'merito et deus est.'

13. **quod si, cum nullius sit...]** An excellent selection of N.T. proofs of our Lord's Divinity; among which it is interesting to find the Synoptists represented as well as the Fourth Gospel. It is true that in Rom. ix 5 some modern commentators render the passage otherwise. But see the commentaries of Gifford or of Sanday and Headlam *ad loc.* and also Illingworth *Doctrine of the Trinity* p. 45. The references are as follows: for lines 11—16, Matt. ix 4, John ii 25, Mark ii 5, John iii 13, John x 30; for lines 19—25, John xx 28, Rom. ix 5, Gal. i 1, 12.

Itaque hoc in loco ex duobus alterum constare debebit. cum enim manifestum sit omnia esse facta per Christum, aut ante omnia est, quoniam *omnia per ipsum*, et merito et deus est: aut quia homo est, post omnia est, et merito per ipsum nihil factum est. sed nihil per ipsum factum esse non possumus dicere, cum animaduertamus *omnia per ipsum facta esse* scriptum. non ergo post omnia est, id est non homo tantum est, qui post omnia est, sed et deus, quoniam deus ante omnia est. ante omnia est enim, quia *per ipsum omnia*; ne si homo tantum, nihil per ipsum; aut si omnia per ipsum, non homo tantum: quoniam si homo tantum, non omnia per ipsum, immo nihil per ipsum. quid ergo respondent? nihil per ipsum, ut homo sit tantum? quomodo ergo omnia per ipsum? ergo non homo tantummodo est, sed et deus, siquidem omnia sunt per ipsum. ut merito intellegere debeamus nec hominem esse Christum tantummodo, qui est post omnia, sed et deum, cum per ipsum facta sint omnia.........quomodo enim aut hominem tantummodo dicas......cum illum etiam in carne

15 nec] non *coni.* Ja. *rectius uero huiusmodi uerba supplere post* omnia (l. 17) 'nec deum tantummodo, qui ante omnia est, sed et hominem, cum caro factus sit.' 18 *post* dicas *nescio quid amissum : fortasse*, cum per ipsum facta sint omnia, aut deum.

2. Not very logically set out. The argument is: if Christ made all things, He is before all things and is therefore God. But if He is mere man, He is after all things and did not create them. This latter statement contradicts the words of Scripture, that 'all things were made through Him' and therefore He is not Man alone but God.

8. Cp. Col. i 17 'ipse est ante omnes': *ib.* 16 'omnia per ipsum.'

9. **ne**] as in xi, p. 36. 18.

15. **nec hominem...facta sint omnia**] The words, as 'nec' shews, require some balancing clause, such as that which I have placed in the critical note. The only alternative would be to suppose that 'nec' is used to throw a stress upon the second member of the sentence, 'sed et deum': as in the classical usage of 'nec' followed by 'et.' But the lacuna in the argument is no less evident here than in line 18.

17. 'For how can you say that He is only man, or only God either, when you see Him as He is in the flesh? but on the contrary, as either nature is observed, either is of necessity accepted as an article of belief.' Surely 'aut deum' has been lost, if nothing more: 'either only Man or only God': the single *aut* is scarcely translatable. Jackson inserts, in a footnote, after 'tantummodo dicas' 'cum per ipsum facta sint omnia, aut deum tantummodo dicas': which also justifies the 'etiam.' For *nisi quoniam* cp. n. on x, p. 32. 2.

conspicias; nisi quoniam si utrumque animaduertitur, utrumque merito credatur?

XIV. Et tamen adhuc dubitat haereticus Christum dicere 14
esse deum, quem deum tot et rebus animaduertit et uocibus approbatum. si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo ueniens in hunc mundum *in sua uenit*, cum homo nullum fecerit mundum? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo mundus *per ipsum factus* esse refertur, cum non per hominem mundus, sed post mundum homo institutus referatur? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo non ex semine tantummodo Christus, sed *uerbum caro factum est et habitauit in nobis*? nam etsi protoplastus non ex semine, sed tamen protoplastus non est ex uerbi et carnis coniunctione concretus: non est enim uerbum caro factum et habitauit in nobis. si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo *qui de caelo uenit, quae uidit et audiit testificatur*, cum constet hominem de caelo, quia ibi nasci non possit, uenire non posse? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo *uisibilia et inuisibilia, throni, uirtutes et dominationes per ipsum et in ipso creata* esse referuntur, cum uirtutes caelestes per hominem fieri non potuerint, quae ante hominem ipsum esse debuerint? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique inuocatus, cum haec hominis natura non sit, sed dei, ut adesse omni loco possit? si homo tantummodo Christus, cur homo in orationibus mediator inuo-

XIV. *Continuing the argument—If Christ were mere man, how is it that He is the Word made Flesh, which cannot be said of Adam? How is it that so many things are predicated of Him in the N.T., which imply that He came down from heaven and is more than man?*

12. **ex semine**] 'of human seed.' Cp. Jo. i 13 'For though the first man was not born of seed, still he was not compounded of the union of the Word and Flesh: for [in Adam's creation] the Word was not made flesh.'

15. John iii 31, 32.

18. Col. i 16.

22. **quomodo adest ubique inuocatus**] An unqualified assertion of the worship of Christ: on the universality of which, consult Liddon *B. L.*[8] pp. 379 sq. It is true that Origen, in his *de Oratione* xv, lays down the principle that Christians pray to the Father through the Son as Mediator and High Priest, and not directly to the Son. And yet elsewhere he vindicates prayer to Christ as practised by the Church (*c. Cels.* viii 12).

catur, cum inuocatio hominis ad praestandam salutem inefficax iudicetur? si homo tantummodo Christus, cur spes in illum ponitur, cum *spes in homine maledicta* referatur? si homo tantummodo Christus, cur non licet Christum sine exitio animae negari, cum in hominem commissum delictum referatur posse dimitti? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo Ioannes Baptista testatur et dicit: *qui post me uenit, ante me factus est, quia prior me fuit*; cum, si homo tantummodo Christus, post Ioannem natus, ante Ioannem esse non possit, nisi quoniam illum, qua deus est, ante praecessit? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo *quae pater facit, et filius facit similiter*, cum homo caelestibus operibus dei similia opera facere non possit? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo *sicut pater in se uitam habet, ita dedit filio uitam habere in semetipso*, cum exemplo patris dei homo in se uitam habere non possit, cum non in aeternitate sit gloriosus, sed in materia mortalitatis effectus? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo refert: *ego sum panis uitae aeternae, qui de caelo descendi*; cum neque panis uitae homo esse possit ipse mortalis, nec de caelo descenderit, nulla in caelo constituta materia fragilitatis? si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo dicit, *quia patrem deum nemo uidit umquam, nisi qui est a deo, hic uidit deum*? quoniam, si homo tantummodo Christus, deum uidere non potuit, quia deum nemo hominum uidit: si autem, dum ex deo est, deum uidit, plus se quam hominem, dum deum uidit, intellegi uoluit. si homo tantummodo Christus, cur dicit: *quid si uideritis filium hominis ascendentem illuc ubi ante erat?* ascendit autem in caelum: ibi ergo fuit, dum illuc redit ubi prius fuit. quod

1. **inuocatio hominis...inefficax]** The bearing of this on the Invocation of Saints is noteworthy.

2. 1 Cor. xv. 19, Jer. xvii 5.

5. **cum in hominem...]** 'though we are told that an offence against a man can be forgiven': referring perhaps to 1 Sam. ii 25 (Vulg. 'si peccauerit uir in uirum, placari ei potest Deus') and Matt. xviii 35.

7. John i 15.

11. John v 19.

14. John v 26.

18. John vi 51 (Vulg.) 'Panis uiuus qui de caelo descendi.' N.'s occasional differences from the Vulgate text in N.T. quotations are interesting.

21. John vi 46.

26. John vi 62.

si de caelo missus a patre est, non utique homo tantum est: homo enim, ut diximus, de caelo uenire non potuit. non igitur ibi ante homo fuit, sed illuc ascendit ubi non fuit; descendit autem dei uerbum, quod ibi fuit, uerbum, inquam, dei et deus, *per quem facta sunt omnia* et *sine quo factum est nihil.* non igitur homo inde sic de caelis uenit, sed dei sermo, id est deus, inde descendit.

XV. Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo ait: *etsi* 15
ego de me testificor, uerum est testimonium meum, quia scio unde uenerim et quo eam; [uos ignoratis unde uenerim aut quo eam, uos secundum carnem iudicatis]? ecce et hic illuc se dicit rediturum, unde se testificatur ante uenisse, missum scilicet de caelo. descendit ergo unde uenit, quo modo illuc uadit unde descendit. ex quo, si homo tantummodo Christus esset, non inde uenisset: atque ideo nec illuc abiret, quoniam non inde uenisset. ueniendo autem inde, unde homo uenire non potest, deum se ostendit uenisse. sed enim huius ipsius descensionis ignari et imperiti Iudaei heredes sibi haereticos istos reddiderunt, quibus dicitur: *uos ignoratis unde ueniam, et quo eam: uos secundum carnem iudicatis.* tam isti quam Iudaei, carnalem

6 sic] scilicet *coni.* Ja. 8 etsi α: si *al.* 10 uos ignoratis... carnem iudicatis *deerat, ni fallor, in* α: *supplet* Pa.

2. 'Therefore He was not there before as Man, but ascended thither where [as Man] He had not been: and He descended as the Word of God, who was there [before], the Word of God, I say, and God.'

XV. *He who came down from heaven is of heaven, not of earth. The heretics are the spiritual heirs of the Jews who knew not whence He came. If Christ is mere man, would He have said, I am not of this world? Yet He is of this world in regard to His Manhood, though it was necessary for Him then to emphasize His Divinity. If He is mere man, He would not have said, I proceeded forth from God, as the Word who is God: nor would He have promised immortality to him who keepeth His saying, which proves that He Himself is immortal. Christ is from Abraham and yet before Abraham. Nor could He have promised to keep His sheep for ever: a promise which He observes. Nor would He say, I and the Father are one, if the Son is not God. The Jews at least understood His words in that sense: and He refuted their objection by a proper distinction of the Persons of the Father and the Son.*

8, 19. John viii 14, 15 Vulg., which has 'unde ueni et quo uado; uos autem nescitis unde uenio aut quo uado.'

solam esse Christi natiuitatem tenentes, nihil aliud Christum esse quam hominem crediderunt, non considerantes illud, quoniam, cum de caelo homo non potuerit uenire, ut merito illuc posset redire, deum esse qui inde descenderit, unde homo uenire non potuerit.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo dicit: *uos ex inferioribus estis, ego desursum sum; uos de hoc mundo estis, ego non sum de hoc mundo*? ideo autem si omnis homo ex hoc mundo est, et ideo in hoc mundo est Christus, an homo tantummodo est? absit. sed considera quod ait: *ego non sum de hoc mundo.* numquid ergo mentitur, cum ex hoc mundo sit, si homo tantummodo sit? aut si non mentitur, non est ex hoc mundo. non ergo homo tantummodo est, quia ex hoc mundo non est. sed ne lateret quis esset, expressit unde esset: *ego*, inquit, *desursum sum*; hoc est, de caelo, unde homo uenire non potest; non enim in caelo factus est. deus est ergo qui desursum est, et idcirco de hoc mundo non est. quamquam etiam quodam modo ex hoc mundo est; unde non deus tantum est Christus, sed et homo; ut merito, quo modo non est ex hoc mundo secundum uerbi diuinitatem, ita ex hoc mundo sit secundum suscepti corporis fragilitatem. homo est enim cum

19 est Christus] sit Christus α.

1. **tenentes**] 'holding to the view that the carnal nativity of Christ was the only one.'

3. Though the clause has begun with 'quoniam' ('that'), the construction changes to accus. and infinitive.

6. John viii 23 Vulg. has 'uos de deorsum estis: ego de supernis sum.'

8. 'Then if every man is of this world and that is why Christ (as being man) is in this world, does it follow that He is only a man?' The underlying thought is that of John i 10 'in mundo erat et mundus per ipsum factus est.' The Word is *in* the world, men whom He made are *of* the world: it follows that He is more than man. The two words 'ideo' are not parallel to each other. But the combination of 'ideo' and 'autem' is strange: there is no sequence of reasoning to account for 'ideo.' Possibly the true reading is *si autem*.

11. 'Does He lie then? if He is only man, He is of this world and therefore lies: otherwise, He is not of this world.'

19. **ut merito**] 'thus it properly follows.'

21. **homo est enim...**] A simple expression of what was subsequently called the hypostatic union (ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν), or union of the two natures in One Person. Cf.

deo iunctus, et deus cum homine copulatus. sed idcirco nunc hic Christus in unam partem solius diuinitatis incubuit, quoniam caecitas Iudaica solam in Christo partem carnis aspexit, et inde in praesenti loco, silentio praeterita corporis fragilitate quae de mundo est, de sua sola diuinitate locutus est, quae de mundo non est: ut in quantum illi inclinauerant, ut hominem illum tantummodo crederent, in tantum illos Christus posset ad diuinitatem suam considerandam trahere, ut re deum crederent, uolens illorum incredulitatem circa diuinitatem suam, omissa interim commemoratione sortis humanae, solius diuinitatis oppositione superare.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo dicit: *ego ex deo prodii et ueni*, cum constet hominem a deo factum esse, non ex deo processisse? ex deo autem homo quo modo non processit, sic dei uerbum processit; de quo dictum est: *eructauit cor meum uerbum bonum.* quod quoniam ex deo est, merito et *apud deum* est: quodque, quia non otiose prolatum est, merito omnia facit; *omnia* enim *per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil.* sed enim hoc uerbum, per quod facta sunt omnia, [deus est]. *et deus*, inquit, *erat uerbum.* deus ergo processit ex

20 deus est *inser.* Ja.

Bp Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, iv, Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, v[8] 262, 263, Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*[2], pp. 131—140 (*v.* Introd. § 5 iii).

2. 'Christ has in this passage laid stress upon the one side, that of His Divinity alone....'

10. 'Forbearing for the moment to mention His Human estate, to overcome their unbelief by simply setting against it His Divinity.' For 'interim' cp. xii 23 n.

12. Jo. viii 42 ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω, where Vulg. has 'processi et ueni': Jo. xvi 28 ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, where Vulg. has 'exiui et ueni': on which *v.* Westcott—'issuing forth from the Father as the spring of Deity.' Jackson is wrong in his criticism, that the ἐξῆλθον refers to the 'Verbi missio in mundum,' and not (as N. thinks) to the 'Verbi generatio ante mundum': the 'entrance into the world' by Incarnation is signified by the ἥκω and ἐλήλυθα in those passages respectively. Mark the careful distinction of terms: 'factum esse' on one side, 'natum esse, procedere, prolatum esse' on the other. See Introd. § 3, p. xxxi.

16. **quod** refers to 'Verbum' with a reference to John i 1 ἦν πρὸς τ. θ.

17. 'And which since it was not uttered without effect, accordingly makes all things.' 'Non otiose,' sc. 'non ut nihil ageret, sed ut per ipsum mundus fieret' (Jackson): cp. Athenag. *Legat.* p. 39 ἐνεργείᾳ προελθεῖν.

deo, dum qui processit sermo, deus est qui processit ex deo. si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo ait: *si quis uerbum meum seruauerit, mortem non uidebit in aeternum*? mortem in aeternum non uidere, quid aliud quam immortalitas est? immortalitas autem diuinitati socia est, quia et diuinitas immortalis est, et immortalitas diuinitatis fructus est. sed enim omnis homo mortalis est; immortalitas autem ex mortali non potest esse. ergo ex Christo homine mortali immortalitas non potest nasci. sed *qui uerbum custodierit*, inquit, *meum, mortem non uidebit in aeternum.* ergo uerbum Christi praestat immortalitatem, et per immortalitatem praestat diuinitatem. quod si non potest exhibere ut immortalem alterum faciat ipse mortalis, hoc autem Christi uerbum exhibet pariter et praestat immortalitatem, non utique homo tantum est, qui praestat immortalitatem, quam, si tantummodo homo esset, praestare non posset. praestando autem diuinitatem per immortalitatem, deum se probat diuinitatem porrigendo, quam, nisi deus esset, praestare non posset.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo inquit: *ante Abraham ego sum*? nemo enim hominum ante eum potest esse ex quo ipse est; nec potest fieri ut quicquam prius

21 quicquam...ipsum γ: quidquam...ipsam Pa.: quisquam [*ut* Ja.]... ipse Mign.

2. John viii 51.

4. **immortalitas autem**] Wisd. vi 20 'incorruptio autem facit esse proximum Deo.' See Introd. § 6, p. lvi.

10. **et per immortalitatem praestat diuinitatem**] sc. to men His brethren. Owing to the difficulty of the words, Welchman wished to invert them ('per diuinitatem praestat immortalitatem') and similarly below, 'praestando immortalitatem per diuinitatem, immortalitatem porrigendo.' But the effect would be mere tautology. The writer does not explain his somewhat bold expression, which 2 Pet. i 4 and 1 Jo. iii 1 may justify. The idea is really the basis of Christian mysticism.

19. **ante Abraham**] Vulg. Jo. viii 58 'antequam A. fieret.' The text used by N. loses (as do Cod. Bezae, and certain MSS. of the Old Latin) the contrast between created and absolute existence (I AM) by omitting 'fieret,' where the best Gk MSS. have γενέσθαι.

21. **quicquam...ipsum**] wrongly corrected by edd. to 'quisquam... ipse,' which would entail a meaningless repetition. The clause (in the neuter) gives a universal scope to the previous clause (in the masculine): cp. Col. i 17 (though not so Vulg.) 'He is before all things.'

fuerit ante illum ex quo ipsum originem sumpsit. sed enim Christus, cum ex Abraham sit, ante Abraham esse se dicit. aut mentitur et fallit, si ante Abraham non fuit, qui ex Abraham fuit: aut non fallit, si etiam deus est, dum ante Abraham fuit. quod nisi fuisset, consequenter, cum ex Abraham fuisset, ante Abraham esse non posset. si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo ait: *et ego agnoscam eas et sequuntur me meae; et ego uitam aeternam do illis, et numquam peribunt in perpetuum*? sed enim cum omnis homo mortalitatis sit legibus alligatus, et idcirco in perpetuum se ipse seruare non possit, multo magis in perpetuum alterum seruare non poterit. at in perpetuum se Christus repromittit salutem daturum; quam si non dat, mendax est: si dat, deus est. sed non fallit; dat enim quod repromittit. deus est ergo, qui salutem perpetuam porrigit; quam homo, qui se ipsum seruare non potest, alteri praestare non poterit.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quid est, quod ait: *ego et pater unum sumus*? quomodo enim *ego et pater unum sumus*, si non et deus est et filius? qui idcirco unum potest dici, dum ex ipso est, et dum filius eius est, et dum ex ipso nascitur, dum ex ipso processisse reperitur; per quod et deus est. quod cum inuidiosum Iudaei putassent, et blasphemum credidissent, eo quod se ostenderat his sermonibus Christus esse deum, ac propterea ad lapides concurrissent, et saxorum ictus inicere gestiissent, exemplo et testimonio scripturarum aduersarios suos fortiter refutauit. *si illos*, inquit, *dixit deos ad quos dei*

7 -am γ Pa.: -o Ja. -o meas ms. Woweri. 20 et dum *coni.* Ja. 23 Christum γ Pa: -us *coni.* Ja. 26 dei *om.* γ Pa.

7. **agnoscam**] Jo. x 27 Vulg. 'cognosco eas et sequuntur me...et non peribunt in aeternum.'

13. **quam si non dat**] Cp. a fine passage in Aug. *de Doctr. Christ.* i 15 'nos immortalitate male usi sumus, ut moreremur; Christus mortalitate bene usus est, ut uiueremus.'

18. **unum**] ἕν, 'one Essence, not one Person: *are* not *am*' (Bp Westcott on John x 30). The neuter gender is here held to imply Sonship and not personal identity. Cp. Tertull. *adu. Praxean* 22 '*Unum sumus* dicens *Ego et Pater* ostendit duos esse quos aequat et iungit,' and *ibid.* 'tam duos quam inseparatos.'

ib. **si non et** cet.] 'If the Son also is not God as well [as man].'

26. John x 35.

uerba facta sunt, et non potest solui scriptura; quem pater sanctificauit et misit in hunc mundum uos dicitis, quia blasphemas, quia dixi: filius dei sum ego? quibus vocibus neque se negauit deum, quin immo deum se esse firmauit. nam quia sine dubitatione dii esse dicuntur, ad quos uerba dei facta sunt, multo magis hic deus, qui melior illis omnibus inuenitur. et nihilominus calumniosam blasphemiam dispositione legitima congruenter refutauit: deum enim se sic intellegi uult, ut filium dei et non ipsum patrem uellet intellegi. *missum* enim se esse dixit, et *multa opera se ex patre ostendisse* monstrauit; ex quo non patrem se sed filium esse intellegi uoluit; et in ultima parte defensionis filii, non patris, fecit mentionem dicendo: *uos dicitis, quia blasphemas, quia dixi: filius dei*

9 se uellet *coni.* Pa.

7. **dispositione legitima**] 'by the just ordering [of relations]': that is, 'by a statement of the just ordering' of relations between the Son and the Father. In iii, p. 10. 8, *dispositio* denotes the nice adjustment of elements in the universe. The word, and its kindred verb, had been used by Tertullian in a similar connexion to that in which it appears here, as a translation of οἰκονομία and a synonym of 'dispensatio.' The following passages from *adu. Praxean* will sufficiently illustrate the meaning. In § 2 'unicum quidem deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam oeconomiam dicimus, ut unici dei sit et filius': 'custodiatur oeconomiae sacramentum, quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit.' In § 3 'simplices expauescunt, quod oeconomiam numerum et dispositionem trinitatis diuisionem praesumunt unitatis, quando unitas, ex semetipsa deriuans trinitatem, non destruatur ab illa, sed administretur.' 'uide ergo, ne tu potius monarchiam destruas, qui dispositionem et dispensationem eius euertis in tot nominibus constitutam, in quot deus uoluit.' In § 9 'bene quod et dominus usus hoc uerbo [sc. *alium*] in persona paracleti non diuisionem significauit, sed dispositionem: *rogabo* enim inquit *patrem, et alium*' etc. In § 19 'qua pater et filius, duo, et hoc non ex separatione substantiae, sed ex dispositione': § 21 'dispositione alium, non diuisione': § 23 'habes filium in terris, habes patrem in caelis, non est separatio ista, sed dispositio diuina.' A study of these passages will shew that Tertullian is struggling to express a distinction of relationships within the unity of God by a term which shall not imply 'division'; and N. in the present passage follows him. For the doctrine, see Martensen *Dogmatics* pp. 102 foll.

9. John x 32, 36.

11. **non patrem se sed filium**] as opposed to Praxeas, whose sect is called by Tertullian 'Patripassian': so too Noetus of Smyrna taught (circ. A.D. 200). Even Callistus is said to have taught that 'the Father suffered with the Son' (Hippol. *Philosophumena* ix 11, 12), but he excommunicated Sabellius, and seems to have been feeling his way towards Nicene Christology.

sum. ita quod ad crimen blasphemiae pertinet, filium se non patrem dicit: quod autem ad diuinitatem spectet ipsius, *ego et pater unum sumus* dicendo, filium se esse et deum probauit. deus est ergo: deus autem sic, ut filius sit, non pater.

XVI. Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo ipse dicit: 16
et omnis qui uidet et credit in me non morietur in aeternum? sed enim qui in hominem solitarium credit et nudum, maledictus dicitur: hic autem, qui credit in Christum non maledictus, sed in aeternum non moriturus refertur. ex quo si aut homo est tantum, ut haeretici uolunt, quomodo quisquis in eum credit non morietur in aeternum, cum maledictus esse teneatur qui confidit in homine? aut si non maledictus, sed potius ad aeternae uitae consecutionem, ut legitur, destinatus, non homo tantummodo Christus, sed et deus; in quem qui credit, et maledictionis periculum deponit, et ad fructum iustitiae accedit.

6 *uiuit* Latin. Ja.

XVI. *If Christ is mere man, how can He promise eternal life to every one who believeth on Him? for a curse is pronounced on those who trust in man. Again, how can He say the Paraclete will take of what is His and declare it? for the Paraclete does not receive knowledge from man but imparts it to him. It follows that Christ either deceives us, which is unthinkable: or the Paraclete, receiving from Christ, is less than Christ. This proves Christ to be God.*

Again, why does He place Himself beside God, without distinction of Deity, in the rule of faith laid down in Jo. xvii 3? *Why does He speak of the glory He had with the Father before the world was? from which His pre-existence necessarily follows; for mere man could only have had it after the world began. This cannot be explained away by predestination, which we dare not interpolate in the Sacred Text. It follows that Christ was in substance before the foundation of the world. But assuming predestination, it must correspond in God's purpose to the order of time: and thus Christ would be subsequent to others, Adam, Abel and the patriarchs.*

6. **omnis qui uidet**] Jo. xi 26 Vulg. 'uiuit,' after the Greek. Probably (as Jackson says) N. has confused the passage with Jo. vi 40.

7. Jerem. xvii 5. Cp. p. 35. 7.

9. **si aut homo est**] The alternatives are stated in a confused way: we might have expected (in line 12) 'aut si deus': but N. alters the point of contrast, and writes as if the former member had been 'maledictus erit quisquis in eum credit.' The first *aut* is in fact pleonastic.

12. **teneatur**] so in pp. 36. 8, 49. 1, of holding a view: in ch. xxx the word is thrice coupled in this sense with *credere*. But perhaps here there is the idea of 'maledictione teneri': 'is placed under a curse.'

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo paraclitum dicit de suo esse sumpturum quae nuntiaturus sit? neque enim paraclitus ab homine quicquam accipit, sed homini scientiam paraclitus porrigit; nec futura ab homine paraclitus discit, sed de futuris hominem paraclitus instruit. ergo aut non accepit paraclitus a Christo homine quod nuntiet, quoniam paraclito homo nihil poterit dare a quo ipse homo debet accipere, et fallit in praesenti loco Christus et decipit, cum paraclitum a se homine accepturum quae nuntiet dicit: aut non nos fallit, sicut nec fallit, et accepit paraclitus a Christo quae nuntiet. sed si a Christo accepit quae nuntiet, maior ergo iam paraclito Christus est: quoniam nec paraclitus a Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset. minor autem Christo paraclitus Christum etiam deum esse hoc ipso probat, a quo accepit quae nuntiat; ut testimonium Christo diuinitatis grande sit, dum minor

2. Jo. xvi 14 'De meo accipiet et annuntiabit uobis,' Vulg. The language of N. may perhaps be interpreted in the same way as that of John xiv 26. Tertullian quoting the same text (*adu. Prax.* 25) says '*de meo sumet*, inquit, sicut ipse de patris.' N. does not attempt to draw any inference from this text with regard to the 'procession' of the Spirit; as for example Basil does, *de Spiritu Sancto* xviii 46. Cp. Franzelin *Tractatus de Deo Trino* p. 452 foll.; *de Processione S. s.* p. 47 foll.

7. **et fallit** cet.] Mark the argument from the moral character of Christ.

9. **aut non nos** sq.] 'Otherwise—as is the case—He does not deceive us, and the Paraclete has received of Christ that which He shall announce.'

11. **maior ergo iam paraclito Christus est**] Similarly in a letter of Athanasius to Serapion (i §§ 21, 25) it is laid down that the Spirit has the same τάξις and φύσις in relation to the Son that the Son has in relation to the Father. Cp. Westcott *ad loc.* This statement of Novatian was misunderstood, and gained for the treatise some circulation, owing to the efforts of 'certain heretics who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit,' as to whom consult Introd. § 2 i. An early editor, John Gangneius, altered the text into conformity with Catholic statement, reading—'Sed si a Christo accepit quae nuntiet, non est homo tantummodo Christus a quo accepit Paracletus Deus non minor, quoniam nec Paracletus a Christo acciperet nisi Deus esset Christus. Christus ergo se Deum esse hoc ipso probat, quod ab eo accepit Paracletus quae nuntiat: ut testimonium...sit dum ab illo Paracletus sumit quae ceteris tradit.'

14. 'By this very fact proves Christ to be God, from whom He has received what He announces.' The question of the Deity of the Holy Ghost (as against the Sabellian view of a mere emanation, or the later view of Macedonius and the Pneumatomachi that He is a κτίσμα or ποίημα) is not raised in this passage.

Christo paraclitus repertus ab illo sumit quae ceteris tradit. quandoquidem si homo tantummodo Christus, a paraclito Christus acciperet quae diceret, non a Christo paraclitus acciperet quae nuntiaret.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quare credendi nobis talem regulam posuit, quo diceret: *haec est autem uita aeterna ut sciant te unum et uerum deum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum*? si noluisset se etiam deum intellegi, cur addidit: *et quem misisti Iesum Christum*, nisi quoniam et deum accipi uoluit? quoniam si se deum nollet intellegi, addidisset: *et quem misisti hominem Iesum Christum.* nunc autem neque addidit, nec se hominem nobis tantummodo Christus tradidit, sed deo iunxit, ut et deum per hanc coniunctionem, sicut est, intellegi uellet. est ergo credendum, secundum praescriptam regulam, in dominum, unum uerum deum, et in eum quem misit Iesum Christum consequenter, qui se nequaquam patri, ut diximus, iunxisset, nisi deum quoque intellegi uellet. separasset enim ab eo, si deum intellegi se noluisset. inter homines enim tantummodo se collocasset, si hominem se esse tantummodo sciret, nec cum deo iunxisset, si se non et deum nosset. nunc et de homine tacet, quoniam hominem illum nemo dubitat, et deo se iungit merito, ut credituris diuinitatis suae formulam poneret.

9 se uoluit *coni.* We. 13 se uellet *coni.* We. 17 se uellet *coni.* We. ab eo γ: se ab eo Pa.

6. **regulam**] cp. n. on i 1.
ib. **quo**] here equivalent to 'ut,' 'as to say.'
ib. Jo. xvii 3 Vulg. has 'Ut cognoscant te solum deum uerum.'
15. **consequenter**] 'similarly' or 'in consequence,' sc. of His being placed next to the Father.
20. **nunc et de homine...**] 'as it is, He says nothing about the Manhood.'
21. 'In order to lay down the definition of His Divinity for those who should believe.' 'Formula' is a lawyer's term, probably in use among the Stoics; it is found in Seneca, whose influence on N. it illustrates. Cf. Hor. *Sat.* II iii 45 'haec magnos formula reges excepto sapiente tenet.' See Introd. § 1.
23. The argument, like many others in the treatise, falls into syllogisms: thus—
(*a*) No one can have anything, unless he first exists.
Christ had glory before the world.
Therefore Christ was before the world.
(*b*) No mere man could have glory before the world:
Christ had this: therefore Christ was not mere man.

Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo dicit: *et nunc honorifica me gloria quam habebam apud te priusquam mundus esset?* si antequam mundus esset gloriam habuit apud deum et claritatem tenuit apud patrem, ante mundum fuit: nec enim habuisset gloriam, nisi ipse prius fuisset, qui gloriam posset tenere. nemo enim habere aliquid poterit, nisi ante ipse fuerit, qui aliquid tenet. sed enim Christus habet gloriam ante mundi institutionem; ergo ante institutionem mundi fuit. nisi enim ante institutionem mundi esset, ante mundi institutionem gloriam habere non posset, cum ipse non esset. sed enim homo gloriam ante mundi institutionem habere non potuit, qui post mundum fuit: Christus autem habuit: ante mundum igitur fuit. non igitur homo tantummodo fuit, qui ante mundum fuit: deus est igitur, quoniam ante mundum fuit et gloriam ante mundum tenuit. nec praedestinatio ista dicatur, quoniam nec posita est. aut addant hoc qui hoc putant. sed uae est adicientibus, quo modo et detrahentibus, positum. non potest ergo dici quod non potest adici. sublata ergo praedestinatione, quae non est posita, in substantia fuit Christus ante mundi institutionem. *uerbum est* enim *per quod facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil.* quoniam et si in praedestinatione dicitur gloriosus, et ante mundi institutionem fuisse praedestinationem, ordo seruetur, et ante hunc erit multus numerus hominum in gloriam destinatus. minor enim per istam destinationem Christus ceteris intellegetur, quibus posterior denotatur. nam si haec

7 habuit *corr.* We. 25 intellegetur *α*: -itur *γ al.*

1. Jo. xvii 5 Vulg. 'Et nunc clarifica me tu...claritate quam habui.'

15. **posita est**] 'expressly stated': cf. p. 64. 9 'quia Deus positus est.' So immediately below, 'positum' denotes 'the written word.'

16. Apoc. xxii 18, 19 Vulg. 'si-quis apposuerit...siquis diminuerit de uerbis.' Cp. Deut. iv 2, xii 32; Prov. xxx 6, 13. But the word *uae* (*οὐαί*) does not occur in any of these places.

21. 'Since even granted that it is in predestination that He is called glorious, and that it is said that the predestination was before the foundation of the world, the order of time must be observed' etc. For the force of the subjunctive *seruetur* cp. 'dicatur' in line 20.

23. Cp. Heb. ii 10.

25. **denotatur**] 'designated' as in pp. 7. 8, 13. 14, and *de Cib. Iud.* ii 'inconstans uideri denotabitur.'

gloria in praedestinatione fuit, praedestinationem istam in gloriam nouissimus Christus accepit: ante enim praedestinatus Adam esse cernetur, et Abel, et Enoch, et Noe, et Abraham, et reliqui ceteri. nam cum apud deum et personarum et rerum omnium ordo digestus sit, ante hanc praedestinationem Christi in gloriam multi praedestinati fuisse dicentur, et hoc pacto minor ceteris hominibus Christus esse deprehendetur, qui melior et maior et antiquior ipsis quoque angelis inuenitur. aut haec igitur omnia tollantur, ut Christo diuinitas auferatur: aut si haec tolli non possunt, Christo ab haereticis diuinitas propria reddatur.

XVII. Quid si Moyses hanc eandem regulam ueritatis 17
exsequitur, et hoc in principio suarum nobis tradidit litterarum, quo discamus omnia creata et condita esse per dei filium, hoc est per dei uerbum? id enim dicit quod Ioannes, quod ceteri; immo et Ioannes et ceteri ab hoc intelleguntur accepisse quod dicant. si enim Ioannes dicit: *omnia per*

6 in gloriam Ja: -a edd. Cf. l. 2. 7 -itur edd.: *corr.* Ja. 9 non auferatur edd.: *corr.* We. 10 si haec t. n. possunt α: si haec in praedestinatione tantum dici non possunt G γ *glossema manifestum.* 14 discamus α: dicamus *al.*

9. The argument is again a dilemma: Christ was glorified either by predestination or else in His own personal essence (*in substantia*, οὐσιωδῶς): if by predestination, He is shewn to be inferior to Adam, Abel etc., which is absurd: therefore He was glorified personally, and is God.

ib. **haec omnia**] The arguments of chapters xi—xvi.

XVII. *The same Rule of Truth appears at the beginning of the Books of Moses, in the account of the Creation by the Word of God, afterwards the Man Christ Jesus. Moses tells us that God made man; and the Evangelist, that through the Word of God all things (and consequently man) were made. It follows that Christ is God; and that in regard to His Person the O.T. and the N.T. are complementary. To deny His Godhead is to contradict both Testaments. Moses assigns to God attributes of infinity, etc. And yet he introduces Him descending to the Tower of Babel and speaking—actions which imply finite conditions. The reference cannot be to the Father nor to an Angel, but to the Son of God, who is higher than the Angels.*

13. **et hoc in principio** sq.] 'and has given us enough, in the beginning of his writings, to teach us' etc. A verbal reference to Gen. i 1.

14. **quo discamus**] cp. the use of *quo* in p. 56. 6.

16. **ceteri**] sc. the other Sacred Writers (not only the Evangelists).

ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil; prophetes autem refert: *dico ego opera mea regi*; Moyses autem introducit praecipientem deum ut lux fiat in primis, caelum firmetur, aquae congregentur, arida ostendatur, fructus secundum semina prouocetur, animalia producantur, luminaria in caelo atque astra ponantur; non alium ostendit tunc adfuisse deo cui praeciperentur haec opera ut fierent, nisi eum *per quem facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil.* ac si hic uerbum dei est (nam *eructauit cor meum uerbum bonum*) ostendit *in principio uerbum fuisse*, et *uerbum* hoc *apud* patrem fuisse, *deum* praeterea *uerbum fuisse, omnia per ipsum facta* esse. sed enim hoc *uerbum caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis*, Christus scilicet filius dei; quem, dum et postmodum secundum carnem hominem accipimus, et ante mundi institutionem dei uerbum et deum uidemus, merito secundum institutionem ueteris et noui testamenti et deum et hominem Christum Iesum et credimus et tenemus.

Quid si idem Moyses introducit dicentem deum: *faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*; et infra: *et fecit deus hominem, ad imaginem dei fecit illum, masculum et feminam fecit eos*? si, ut iam docuimus, dei filius est per quem facta sunt omnia, utique dei filius est per quem etiam homo institutus est, propter quem facta sunt omnia. sed enim deo praecipiente ut homo fiat, deus refertur esse qui hominem facit: facit autem hominem dei filius, uerbum

1. Jo. i 3.

2. Ps. xliv 2 (xlv 1). See above, xiii p. 42. 10 with note.

6. It is not easy to decide whether N. had or had not before his mind the interpretation of Genesis i 1, which appears largely in later Latin writers, by which 'in principio' (ἐν ἀρχῇ) is made to mean 'in the personal Word, who is the Beginning.' See for ex. Aug. *Conf.* xi 11, with Dr Gibb's note.

ib. **cui praeciperentur haec opera ut fierent**] 'on whom was to be laid the command that these works should be made.'

13. **postmodum**] sc. after the Incarnation: in xxxi, p. 118 l. 7 the word has the same reference.

15. **institutionem**] 'instruction,' but in l. 14 'inauguration' or 'beginning': cp. iii 1 note. The two senses are not far apart.

18. Gen. i 26, 27. Vulg. reads in *v.* 27 'creauit' for 'fecit.'

23. The argument turns on the assumption that the 'God' who made man is the person addressed when 'God' said 'Let us make.'

scilicet dei, *per quem facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil.* hoc autem uerbum caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis: ergo Christus est deus. per Christum igitur homo factus est, ut per dei filium. sed deus hominem ad imaginem dei fecit; deus est ergo qui fecit hominem ad imaginem dei; deus ergo Christus est. ut merito nec ueteris testamenti circa personam Christi uacillet auctoritas, dum noui testamenti manifestatione fulcitur, nec noui testamenti intercepta sit potestas, dum radicibus ueteris testamenti eiusdem nititur ueritas. ex quo, qui Christum, dei filium et hominis, tantummodo praesumunt hominem, non et deum, contra testamentum et uetus et nouum faciunt, dum et ueteris et noui testamenti auctoritatem ueritatemque corrumpunt.

Quid si idem Moyses ubique introducit deum patrem immensum atque sine fine, non qui loco cludatur, sed qui omnem locum cludat: nec eum qui in loco sit, sed potius in quo omnis locus sit: omnia continentem et cuncta complexum, ut merito nec descendat nec ascendat, quoniam ipse omnia et continet et implet: et tamen nihilominus introducit deum descendentem ad turrem quam aedificabant filii hominum, considerare quaerentem, et dicentem: *uenite et mox descendamus, et confundamus*

20 considerate *coni.* We.

7. **personam**] equivalent of ὑπόστασις in the Greek Fathers. Cp. Westcott on Hebr. i 3, where however ὑπόστασις has the earlier sense of οὐσία 'essence' (Vulg. 'substantiae'). The later use appears in the Cappadocian formula *μία οὐσία ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν*. See Introd. § 7 on 'Person.'

8. **manifestatione**] 'revelation,' sc. of Christ. This is parallel to the saying of Augustine (*Quaest.* 73 *in Exod.*) 'nouum testamentum in uetere latet, uetus t. in nouo patet' and in his *de Catech. Rudibus* § 8 'in ueteri t. est occultatio noui, in nouo t. est manifestatio ueteris.' It is to be understood on the principle that throughout the Bible Christ is preached (Rev. xix 10).

ib. **intercepta**] 'undermined'; cp. p. 63. 14 'ne maiestatis ipsius... fulgore intercipi possit.' For this use of the word cp. Plin. *Paneg.* 75 'quae uos, ne qua interciperet obliuio, in acta mittenda censuistis.'

15. **non qui loco cludatur**] expresses the attribute 'incomprehensible' (Gk ἀχώρητος, Lat. 'immensus') of the *Quicumque uult*.

21. **uenite et mox descendamus**] Gen. xi 7. The words 'et mox' present a difficulty. Previous editors have printed them as N.'s own words, separating 'uenite' from 'descendamus' in order to emphasize the fact that others are invited to accompany the speaker. But in that case we should have expected in l. 6 *infra* to read simply 'uenite,

illic ipsorum linguas ut non audiat unusquisque uocem proximi sui? quem uolunt hic deum descendisse ad turrem illam, et homines tunc illos uisitare quaerentem? deum patrem? ergo iam loco cluditur: et quomodo ipse omnia complectitur? aut numquid angelum cum angelis dicit descendentem, et dicentem: *uenite et mox descendamus, et confundamus illic ipsorum linguas?* sed enim in Deuteronomio animaduertimus rettulisse deum haec, deumque dixisse, ubi ponitur: *cum disseminaret filios Adam, statuit fines gentium iuxta numerum angelorum dei.* neque ergo pater descendit, ut res indicat; neque angelus ista praecipit, ut res probat. superest ergo, ut ille descenderit, de quo apostolus Paulus: *qui descendit, ipse est qui ascendit super omnes caelos, ut impleret omnia,* hoc est dei filius, dei uerbum. *uerbum* autem dei *caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis*: hic erit Christus: deus ergo pronuntiabitur Christus.

18 XVIII. Ecce idem Moyses refert alio in loco, quod

descendamus.' It is a more satisfactory view that 'et mox' forms part of the quotation, which answers to δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες συγχέωμεν of LXX. It may be conjectured that some such word as τάχα had found its way into the Greek text after καί, and that N.'s version reproduces this.

5. **numquid angelum** cet.] scil. it was no *mere* Angel.

7. Deut. xxxii 8; Vulg. 'Quando separabat filios Adam, constituit terminos populorum iuxta numerum filiorum Israel': but LXX has ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. The argument is contained in 'rettulisse *deum* haec,' scil. 'non angelum.' N. makes the 'disseminatio' refer to the dispersion at the Tower of Babel.

11. **ut ille descenderit**] Bp Bull *D. F. N.* IV iii holds that the ante-Nicene Fathers for the most part expressed themselves unguardedly, in their zeal to prove, as against the heretics, that the Person of the Son is distinct from the Father. Thus they seem to forget that the nature of the Son is no less 'inuisibilis et immensa' than that of the Father. In reality, however, they held that the Son, as having His origin from the Father, can hold the office of Angel or Announcer of His Will, and while equally invisible and 'incomprehensible,' did 'by way of an economy' shew Himself in certain places to men by means of certain sensible symbols of His presence.

12. Eph. iv 10.

XVIII. *Moses says that God was seen by Abraham: and yet he says elsewhere that no one can see God and live; and so the N.T. It follows that not the Father but the Son was seen. He is the Image of God, through whose vision man may in time rise to the vision of God.*

As the sun does not rise upon a sudden in noontide splendour, thus human vision is gradually habituated to the vision of the Son and shall at last behold the Father. Hence it is the Son of God, the Word, who has been seen and has dwelt among us.

Abrahae uisus sit deus. atqui idem Moyses audit a deo, quod *nemo hominum* deum *uideat et uiuat.* si uideri non potest deus, quomodo uisus est deus? aut si uisus est, quomodo uideri non potest? nam et Ioannes, *deum nemo*, inquit, *uidit umquam*; et apostolus Paulus: *quem uidit hominum nemo, nec uidere potest.* sed non utique scriptura mentitur; ergo uere uisus est deus. ex quo intellegi potest, quod non pater uisus sit, qui numquam uisus est, sed filius, qui et descendere solitus est, et uideri quia descenderit. *imago* est enim *inuisibilis dei*, ut mediocritas et fragilitas condicionis humanae deum patrem uidere aliquando iam tunc assuesceret in imagine dei, hoc est, in filio dei. gradatim enim et per incrementa fragilitas humana nutriri debuit per imaginem

The Angel who could promise Hagar a son was Divine: not God the Father, for an Angel is subject to another, but God the Son, the Angel of Great Counsel. Thus those heretics gainsay the O.T. who pronounce Christ an Angel but not God.

The Angel (one of three) who visited Abraham at the oak of Mamre, and was addressed by him as Lord, cannot have been God the Father, who is invisible, nor a mere Angel, who is finite, but God the Son alone, and the feast that followed was itself a mystery. Again, it is repeatedly said 'The Lord rained on Sodom fire from the Lord.' Thus Christ, the Son of God, the Word begotten of the Father before Abraham was, became the guest of Abraham.

The Angel at his second visit to Hagar speaks again as Lord and God, the Angel of Great Counsel. Christ is declared in Scripture to be not only Man but Angel, not only Angel but God, who sets forth the heart of the Father.

1. Gen. xii 7 ὤφθη Κύριος τῷ Ἄβραμ, LXX, 'apparuit,' Vulg.

2. Exod. xxxiii 20.

4. 1 Jo. iv 12.

5. 2 Tim. vi 16 Vulg. 'quem nullus hominum uidit, sed nec uidere potest.'

9. **imago est enim**] εἰκών in Col. i 15, on which see Bishop Lightfoot's note, and Jo. i 18: cf. χαρακτήρ in Hebr. i 3. The archetype has its copy, the seal its impression. Hippol. *c. Noet.* 7 διὰ γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνος ὁμοίας τυγχανούσης εὔγνωστος ὁ πατὴρ γίνεται: Tertull. *adu. Marc.* v 19 'scientes filium semper retro uisum, si quibus uisus est in dei nomine, ut imaginem ipsius.'

10. **mediocritas**] cp. p. 38. 16 'si mediocritates in illo approbant humanam fragilitatem.' So here 'that ordinary human frailty might grow accustomed' etc. *Aliquando* (with 'uidere') 'at length.' Cp. *de Laud. Mart.* xxv 'despecta nostra fragilitas.' For the thought cp. Irenaeus v 35. 1, 36. 2.

13. **per imaginem**] 'by the image,' i.e. express presentment to human sight. The vision of God in the O.T. is similarly discussed by Tertullian: 'God was seen according to men's capacity, not according to the fulness of His Divinity'; and again 'we are to understand the Father to be invisible according to the fulness of His majesty, but the Son visible in the exact degree of His derivation (pro modulo deriuationis),' sc. from

ad istam gloriam, ut deum patrem uidere possit aliquando. periculosa sunt enim quae magna sunt, si repentina sunt. nam etiam lux solis subita post tenebras splendore nimio insuetis oculis non ostendet diem, sed potius faciet caecitatem. quod ne in damnum humanorum contingat oculorum, paulatim disruptis et dissipatis tenebris, ortus luminaris istius mediocribus incrementis fallenter assurgens oculos hominum sensim assuefacit ad totum orbem suum ferendum per incrementa radiorum. sic ergo et Christus, id est imago dei et filius dei, ab hominibus inspicitur, qua poterat uideri. et ideo fragilitas et mediocritas sortis humanae per ipsum alitur, producitur, educatur, ut aliquando deum quoque ipsum patrem, assueta filium conspicere, possit, *ut est, uidere*; ne maiestatis ipsius repentino et intolerabili fulgore percussa intercipi possit, ut deum patrem quem semper optauit uidere non possit. ex quo filius est hic qui uidetur; dei autem filius, dei uerbum est; dei autem uerbum caro factum est et habitauit in nobis: hic autem Christus est. quae, malum, ratio est ut dubitetur deus dici, qui tot modis deus intellegitur approbari?

Ac si et Agar ancillam Sarae de domo eiectam pariter et fugatam angelus conuenit apud fontem aquae in uia Sur, fugae

1 posset *edd.*: Ja *corr. suppl. ex a.* 19 qui tot modis d. i. adprobari Pa

the Fountain of all Being. He illustrates by the analogy of the sun and his rays; the latter we endure 'pro temperatura portionis quae in terram inde [sc. a sole] porrigitur' (*adu. Praxean* c. xiv). But he has not Novatian's fine comparison of the growing Vision of God to the breaking of the dawn.

3. **lux solis subita**] Cp. ch. ii, p. 8. 20 sq.

11. **producitur**] 'is advanced.'

12. 'That at last...it may be able to see God the Father also as He is.' So 1 Jo. iii 6 'quoniam uidebimus eum (sc. 'deum,' according to N.) sicuti est.' The mediation of Christ between the Infinite Godhead and finite human intelligence is well expressed in a passage quoted by Jackson: Euseb. *Demonstr. Euang.* iv 6 *ὡς ἂν μὴ παντελῶς ἡ τῶν γεννητῶν ἀποπέσοι φύσις δι' οἰκείαν ἀτονίαν καὶ ἀδυναμίαν τῆς ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀχωρήτου πατρικῆς οὐσίας διεστῶσα, μένοι δὲ καὶ αὔξοι καὶ τρέφοιτο τῆς μέσης ἀπολαύουσα χορηγίας, ἣν ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος οὔποτε τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐπαρκῶν διαλιμπάνει, πάντῃ δὲ χωρῶν καὶ διὰ πάντων περιπορευόμενος, πάντων ἐξ ἴσης τῆς σωτηρίας προνοεῖ.*

14. **intercipi**] see p. 60. 8 note.

18. **quae, malum, ratio**] a startling colloquialism: 'what reason in the world?'

causas interrogat atque accipit, et post haec humilitatis consilia porrigit, spem praeterea illi materni nominis facit, quodque ex utero eius multum semen esset futurum spondet atque promittit, et quod Ismael ex illa nasci haberet, et cum ceteris aperit locum habitationis ipsius, actumque describit: hunc autem angelum et dominum scriptura proponit et deum (nam nec benedictionem seminis promisisset, nisi angelus et deus fuisset): quaerant quid in praesenti loco haeretici tractent. pater fuit iste qui ab Agar uisus est, an non? quia deus positus est. sed absit deum patrem angelum dicere; ne alteri subditus sit, cuius angelus fuerit. sed angelum dicent fuisse. quomodo ergo deus erit, si angelus fuit, cum non sit hoc nomen angelis umquam concessum? nisi quoniam ex utroque latere nos ueritas in istam concludit sententiam, qua intellegere debeamus dei filium fuisse: qui, quoniam ex deo est, merito deus, quia dei filius, dictus sit, quoniam patri subditus et annuntiator paternae uoluntatis est, *magni consilii angelus* pronuntiatus est. ergo si hic locus neque personae patris

14 qua Pa: quia γ *al.* 16 patri subditus et *om.* γ *al. suppl.* Pa. 18 hic *om.* γ *al. suppl.* Pa.

4. 'And that Ishmael was to be born from her': late Lat. periphrasis for future, from which the Italian and French fut. is compounded ('facere habeo' = 'farò,' 'ferai'). Cp. xix, p. 70. 8.

5. **ipsius**] sc. of Ishmael. *Cum ceteris* 'among other things.'

ib. **actum**] 'manner of life.' Cp. Cypr. *de Unit.* 21 'sit in actu suo cum disciplina modestus'; *de Laps.* 21 'actus nostri et animi secreta...ponderemus'; *de Domin. Or.* 14 'quominus...noster animus atque actus deo obsequatur'; and Pseudo-Cypr. *de Spect.* i 'in uitae actu graues.'

8. **quaerant...**] 'the heretics must consider what they make of the passage in question.'

9. **positus est**] 'is stated, declared,' as in p. 57. 20.

13. **nisi quoniam**] 'unless it is the case that,' giving the true hypothesis. Cf. p. 46. 1, *infra* p. 65. 22.

14. **qua**] sc. 'sententia': some emend, needlessly, to *quia*.

16. **dictus sit**] The subjunctive is merely due to the subjective character of the particle 'merito,' 'It follows that He is declared to be God.'

17. Isaiah ix 6 LXX μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος, Vulg. 'admirabilis consiliarius deus fortis.' The word 'angelus' in this connexion came to be distasteful. Jerome quotes the passage with 'nuntius' in its place (see Sabatier *in loc.*). Cp. the 'Angel of the Covenant,' Mal. iii 1. On this idea of a Theophany in O.T. times see *Speaker's Comm.* on Gen. xii 7.

18. The argument is: He is both God and Angel; terms which only meet in the Person of the Son of

congruit, ne angelus dictus sit, neque personae angeli, ne deus pronuntiatus sit; personae autem Christi conuenit ut et deus sit, quia dei filius est, et angelus sit, quoniam paternae dispositionis annuntiator est: intellegere debent contra scripturas se agere haeretici, qui Christum cum dicant se et angelum credere, nolint illum etiam deum pronuntiare, quem in ueteri testamento ad uisitationem generis humani legunt saepe uenisse.

Adhuc adiecit Moyses, Abrahae uisum deum apud quercum Mambre, sedente ipso ad ostium tabernaculi sui meridie, et nihilominus, cum tres conspexisset uiros, unum ex illis dominum nuncupasse; quorum cum pedes lauisset, cinericios panes cum butyro et ipsius copia lactis offert, et ut hospites retenti uescerentur, hortatur. post quae et quod pater futurus esset, audit; et quod Sara uxor eius paritura ex ipso filium esset, ediscit; et de exitu Sodomitarum, quae merebantur pati, recognoscit; et quod propter clamorem Sodomorum deus descendisset, addiscit. quo in loco si patrem uolunt uideri tunc fuisse cum angelis duobus hospitio receptum, patrem uisibilem haeretici crediderunt: si autem angelum, cum ex angelis tribus unus dominus nuncupatur, cur, quod non solet, angelus deus dicitur? nisi quoniam, ut deo patri inuisibilitas propria reddatur, et angelo propria mediocritas remittatur, non nisi dei filius, qui et deus est, Abrahae uisus et hospitio receptus esse credetur. quod enim erat futurus, meditabatur in sacramento Abrahae factus hospes, apud Abrahae filios

God. The same argument is found also in Hilary *de Trin.* iv § 23: *v.* Bp Bull *D. F. N.* IV iii §§ 8, 14. 'Hic locus,' the passage of Scripture about Hagar.

ib. **personae patris**] *v.* Introd. § 7.

11. Gen. xviii 1.

12. **cinericios**] Gen. xviii 6 Vulg. 'fac subcinericios panes.'

16. **exitu**] Cp. p. 25. 8 'urbium et ciuitatium exitus.'

23. **mediocritas**] 'inferior position,' here of angels as in p. 62. 10 *supra* of man. The thought is the same as that of lines 18—4 (pp. 64, 65).

25. 'For when He became the guest of Abraham, He rehearsed ('meditabatur') in a mystery (or sacramentally) that which He was about to be, because He was one day to be the like with Abraham's sons, whose feet He washed in token that it was He: requiting in the sons the right of hospitality which their father had once upon a time advanced to Him (as a kind of loan).' It is best to supply

futurus; cuius filiorum pedes, ad probationem quod ipse esset, abluit; reddens in filiis ius hospitalitatis, quod aliquando illi faenerauerat pater. unde et ne qua esset dubitatio quin iste Abrahae hospes fuisset, in Sodomitarum exitu ponitur: *quoniam pluit dominus super Sodomam et Gomorrham ignem et sulpur a domino de caelo.* sic enim et prophetes ex persona dei: *subuerti uos*, inquit, *sicut subuertit dominus Sodomam et Gomorrham.* dominus ergo Sodomam subuertit, id est, deus Sodomam subuertit: sed in subuersione Sodomorum dominus pluit ignem a domino. hic autem dominus uisus est Abrahae deus: deus autem hic hospes est Abrahae uisus utique quia tactus. sed cum pater, quia inuisibilis, nec tunc utique uisus sit, uisus est et hospitio receptus et acceptus est, qui solitus est tangi et uideri: hic autem filius dei *dominus a domino pluit super Sodomam et Gomorrham sulpur atque ignem.* hic autem dei uerbum est: *uerbum* autem dei *caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis*: hic autem Christus est. non pater igitur apud Abraham hospes, sed Christus fuit; nec tunc pater uisus est, sed filius; uisus autem est Christus. merito igitur Christus et dominus et deus est, qui non aliter Abrahae uisus est, nisi quia ante ipsum Abraham ex patre deo deus sermo generatus est.

Adhuc, inquit, idem angelus et deus eandem Agar, fugatam de domo Abrahae cum puero, consolatur et uisitat. nam cum illa in solitudine exposuisset infantem, quia aqua defecisset ex utre, cumque puer ille clamasset, fletum et planctum leuasset, *et audiuit*, inquit scriptura, *deus uocem pueri de loco ubi erat.*

12 quia γ We: qua Pa. 13 hospitibus γ Pa: *corr.* We. 14 filius qui solitus *coni.* Ja. 22 deus sermo γ *edd.* We Ja: deus Pa.

hospes with *futurus*. It is noteworthy that the application of the 'Three Men' in a Trinitarian sense does not appear in Novatian.

5. **pluit dominus ... a domino**] Gen. xix 24, quoted by Tertull. *adu. Prax.* xiii in replying to the heretics who accuse the Church of teaching 'duos esse Deos'; and before him by Iren. iii 6.

7. Amos iv 11.

21. **ante ipsum Abraham**] Jo. viii 58.

27. **et audiuit**] Gen. xxi 17. LXX εἰσήκουσε δέ, which is closely followed here (as generally by No-

cum deum esse, qui uocem audisset infantis, rettulisset, adiecit: *et uocauit angelus domini ipsam Agar de caelo*; angelum referens esse quem deum dixerat, et dominum pronuntians esse quem angelum collocarat. quique angelus et deus adhuc ipsi Agar promittit maiora solacia, dicendo: *ne timueris; exaudiui enim uocem pueri de loco ubi erat. surge, sume puerum, et tene: in gentem enim magnam faciam eum.* hic angelus, si angelus tantum est, cur hoc sibi uindicat ut dicat: *in gentem enim magnam faciam eum*, cum hoc utique genus potentiae dei sit, angeli esse non possit? ex quo etiam deus confirmatur esse qui hoc potest facere. quoniam ut hoc ipsum comprobetur, adicitur per scripturam statim: *et aperuit deus oculos eius, et uidit puteum aquae uiuae, et abiit, et impleuit utrem de puteo, et dedit puero, et erat deus cum puero.* si ergo hic deus erat cum puero, qui aperuit oculos Agar, ut uideret puteum aquae uiuae et hauriret aquam propter urgentem sitis necessitatem; hic autem deus e caelo illam uocat; angelus dictus, cum superius uocem audiens clamantis pueri deus esset potius, non alius intellegitur quam angelus esse pariter et deus. quod cum patri competens et conueniens esse non possit, qui tantummodo deus est, competens autem esse possit Christo, qui non tantummodo deus sed et angelus pronuntiatus est, manifeste apparet

1 uocem audiuit infantis *corr.* Ja *ex ms.* Wow. 4 quique] *fortasse* qui. 18 potius] positus *corr.* Ja.

vatian in O.T. quotations). Gallandius' conjecture 'exaudiuit' (from Vulg.) is unwarranted.

4. **collocarat**] 'had represented': cp. pp. 30. 18, 95. 8.

ib. **quique**] 'He, being Angel and God,' introducing a fresh sentence.

6. Gen. xxi 18.

8. **cur hoc sibi** cet.] 'why does he claim the power of saying...?'

12. Gen. xxi 19, 20.

13. **uiuae**] ζῶντος LXX: not in Vulg.

14. **hic deus erat**] Both here and in line 17 below, the word 'deus' has the force of a predicate.

17. 'He who is called an Angel, although, earlier in the narrative, when He heard the cry of the boy, it was rather God, is understood, etc.' Jackson emends *Deus esset positus*, thus weakening the text. *Hic...uocat* depends on *si ergo*: the apodosis begins at *angelus dictus*, the subject to *intellegitur*.

20. **competens et conueniens**] 'appropriate and becoming.' Cp. note on 'non qui loco cludatur,' p. 60. 15. A good instance of *competere* in this sense is in Tert. *de Bapt.* 4 'quamquam ad simplicem actum competat similitudo.'

non patrem ibi tunc locutum fuisse ad Agar, sed Christum potius, cum deus sit, cui etiam angeli competit nomen, quippe cum *magni consilii angelus* factus sit; angelus autem sit, dum exponit sinum patris, sicut Ioannes edicit. si enim ipse Ioannes hunc eundem, qui sinum exponit patris, uerbum dicit carnem factum esse, ut sinum patris posset exponere, merito Christus non solum homo est, sed et angelus; nec angelus tantum, sed et deus per scripturas ostenditur, et a nobis hoc esse creditur, ne, si non Christum tunc locutum ad Agar uoluerimus accipere, aut angelum deum faciamus, aut deum patrem omnipotentem inter angelos computemus.

XIX. Quid si et alio in loco similiter legimus deum 19
angelum positum? nam cum apud uxores suas Liam atque Rachel Iacob de patris illarum iniquitate quereretur, et cum referret quod iam in terram propriam remeare et reuerti cuperet, somnii quoque sui interponebat auctoritatem, quo tempore refert sibi angelum dei per somnium dixisse: *Iacob*,

4 si enim *α*: sed enim *al.* 7 sed et angelus *α*: sed angelus *γ al.*

4. **exponit sinum**] 'sets forth the bosom,' i.e. inmost purpose. The expression is based upon Jo. i 18 ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. Cf. Tertull. *adu. Prax.* xxi 'hic unus sinum Patris disseruit, non sinum suum Pater': *Tract. pseudo-Origen.* 102. 20 sq. 'sermo diuinus qui sinum Patris enarrauit': and below, xxviii, p. 101 l. 16. The word ἐξηγήσατο in St John has no expressed object: these writers must in thought have supplied τὸν κόλπον.

XIX. *Further proof that the Angel of the O.T. is Christ. There is the vision of an Angel in a dream to Jacob before his departure from Laban. This Angel who calls himself God speaks also of the 'Place of God,' i.e. of the Father: whereas the Son is God and Angel. It is dangerous to deny Him the name of God. The Son is also God and Man: as the story of the wrestling of Jacob shews. It prefigures the contention between Christ and the Jews: in which they gained the victory of their unrighteousness, but were thereby lamed in the walk of faith and safety. The new name Israel symbolizes the vision of Him with whom Jacob wrestled: he held Him fast as Man but asked His blessing as God. In the Gospel this mystery is fulfilled, the guilt of the Jews being proved. Thus again, in Gen.* xlviii, *the blessing of Jacob on the sons of Joseph, God and the Angel are identified and the sign of the cross is made.*

13. **nam cum** cet.] Grammatically, the main verb is *interponebat*, but the logical conclusion or apodosis is only reached at p. 69. 9 'non tantummodo' etc.

17. Gen. xxxi 11—13: the text follows LXX not Hebrew. Thus 'uariatos albos et uarios et cinericios et aspersos' renders διαλεύκους

Iacob. et ego, inquit, *dixi: quid est? aspice, inquit, oculis tuis, et uide hircos et arietes ascendentes super oues et capras uariatos albos et uarios et cinericios et aspersos. uidi enim quaecumque tibi Laban fecit. ego sum deus qui uisus sum tibi in loco dei, ubi unxisti mihi illic stantem lapidem, et uouisti mihi illic uotum. nunc ergo surge, et proficiscere de terra hac, et uade in terram natiuitatis tuae, et ero tecum.* si angelus dei loquitur haec ad Iacob, atque ipse angelus infert, dicens: *ego sum deus qui uisus sum tibi in loco dei*, non tantummodo hunc angelum sed et deum positum sine ulla haesitatione conspicimus, quippe sibi uotum refert ab Iacob destinatum esse *in loco dei*, et non dicit "in loco meo." est ergo locus dei, est et hic deus. sed enim ibi simpliciter est *in loco dei* positum; neque enim dictum est "in loco angeli et dei," sed tantummodo "dei." hic autem qui ista promittit, deus atque angelus esse perhibetur; ut merito distinctio sit inter eum qui tantummodo deus dicitur, et inter eum qui non deus simpliciter sed et angelus pronuntiatur. ex quo si nullius alterius angeli potest hic accipi tanta auctoritas, ut deum quoque se esse fateatur et uotum sibi factum esse testetur, nisi tantummodo Christi, cui, non quia angelo tantum, sed quia deo, uotum uoueri potest, manifestum est non patrem accipi posse, sed filium, deum et angelum. hic autem si Christus est, sicuti est, uehementer periclitatur, qui aut hominem Christum aut angelum tantum-

5 unxisti α: erexisti γ *al.* 21 quia...quia *fortasse legendum* qua...qua.

('streaked with white') *καὶ ποικίλους καὶ σποδοειδεῖς* ('grizzled') *ῥαντούς*, where Vulg. has 'uarios maculosos atque respersos.' Below, 'qui uisus sum tibi in loco dei' is *ὁ ὀφθείς σοι ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ*, but Vg. has merely 'ego sum deus Bethel.' 'Et ero tecum' (*καὶ ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ*) is wanting in Vg.

8. **infert dicens**] 'proceeds with the assertion.' Cf. p. 42. 10 'appellat inferendo,' with note.

12. The writer argues from the words *in loco dei* (not *meo*, as might have been expected), that 'deus' is used of the Father, 'deus atque angelus' of the Son. 'Et hic' means 'the Speaker also': though He is God, He speaks of 'the place of God,' meaning Another than Himself.

18. 'If there is no other Angel whose authority we can allow to stand so high that He professes Himself to be also God.' Similarly in l. 22 'that we cannot allow that it is the Father but the Son.'

23. **uehementer periclitatur**] to hold the right faith is 'saluus esse.'

modo dicit, subtracta illi diuini nominis potestate, quam ex scripturarum caelestium fide frequenter accepit, quae illum et angelum frequenter et deum dicunt.

His omnibus etiam illud accedit, ut quo modo illum et angelum frequenter et deum posuit scriptura diuina, sic illum et hominem ponat et deum exprimens eadem scriptura diuina quod erat futurus, et depingens iam tum in imagine quod habebat esse in substantiae ueritate. *remansit* enim, inquit, *Iacob solus, et luctabatur homo cum eo usque in mane: et uidit quoniam non potest aduersus eum, et tetigit latitudinem femoris Iacob, cum in eum luctaretur* et ipse cum eo, *et dixit ei: dimitte me, ascendit enim lucifer. et ille dixit: non te dimittam, nisi me benedixeris. et dixit: quod est nomen tuum? et ille dixit, Iacob. dixitque ei: non uocabitur iam nunc nomen tuum Iacob, sed Israel erit nomen tuum: quia inualuisti cum deo, et cum hominibus potens es.* et adhuc adicit: *et uocauit Iacob nomen loci illius, uisio dei; uidi enim deum facie ad faciem, et salua facta est anima mea. ortusque est ei sol, mox ut transiuit uisionem dei; ipse uero claudicabat femore suo.* homo, inquit, luctabatur cum Iacob. si homo solitarius, quis est iste? unde est? quare cum Iacob contendit atque luctatur? quid intercesserat? quid factum fuerat? quae ratio contentionis istius tantae tantique certaminis? quare praeterea Iacob, qui ad tenendum hominem

14 etiam nunc edd. Angl. *ut* p. 71. 13. 19 mox transiuit edd.: *corr.* Ja.

7. 'And even thus early representing in a figure that nature which He was to have in very substance.' Cp. 'nasci haberet,' p. 64. 4.

8. **remansit enim** sqq.] Gen. xxxii 24—27. The version renders LXX pretty closely: thus for 'tetigit latitudinem femoris Iacob,' LXX has ἥψατο τοῦ πλάτους τοῦ μηροῦ αὐτοῦ, Vg. has 'tetigit neruum femoris eius.' But N. omits καὶ ἐνάρκησε τὸ πλάτος τοῦ μηροῦ (Vg. 'et statim emarcuit'). Below, 'inualuisti' etc. follows ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατὸς ἔσῃ, as against Vg. 'si contra deum fortis fuisti, quanto magis contra homines praeualebis.' Similarly in the following quotation (verses 30, 31); e.g. 'uisio dei,' εἶδος θεοῦ, but Vg. 'Phanuel.'

19. **mox ut transiuit**] ἡνίκα παρῆλθε.

22. **quid intercesserat?**] 'What had come between them?'

24. 'Why...is Jacob found to have on that account asked the blessing, unless it was because...' The ingeniously perverse interpretation which follows (ignoring,

cum quo luctabatur fortis inuenitur, et benedictionem ab eo quem detinebat postulat quia iam lucifer oritur, ideo postulasse reperitur, nisi quoniam praefigurabatur contentio haec inter Christum et filios Iacob futura, quae in euangelio dicitur perfecta? contra hunc enim hominem colluctatus est populus Iacob, in qua colluctatione potentior populus est Iacob repertus, quippe cum aduersus Christum iniquitatis suae uictoriam sit consecutus: quo in tempore, propter facinus quod admisit, incessu fidei propriae et salutis claudicare grauissime incertus et lubricus coepit: qui, quamuis superior damnando Christum repertus, eget tamen ipsius misericordia, eget tamen ipsius benedictione. sed enim hic homo, qui cum Iacob luctatus est: *non*, inquit, *uocabitur etiam nunc nomen tuum Iacob, sed Israel erit nomen tuum.* ac si Israel est homo uidens deum, eleganter ostendebat dominus quod non tantum homo esset, qui colluctabatur tunc cum Iacob, sed et deus. uidebat utique deum Iacob, cum quo colluctabatur, quamuis hominem ipsius in colluctatione retineret. et ut nulla adhuc posset esse dubitatio, interpretationem ipse posuit dicendo: *quia inualuisti cum deo, et cum hominibus potens es.* ob quam causam hic idem Iacob intellegens iam uim sacramenti, et peruidens auctoritatem eius cum quo luctatus fuisset, nomen loci illius in quo colluctatus est, uocauit *uisionem dei.* superstruxit praeterea causas ad interpretationem *uisionis dei* porrigendam: *uidi*

14 uincens *coni.* We. 24 uisionis *om.* priores: *ins.* We.

in the notion of *iniquitatis suae uictoriam*, the 'man's' unqualified commendation) contrasts with the fine application of the story, in Charles Wesley's hymn 'Come, O Thou Traveller unknown,' to the Christian in prayer. The 'ideo' refers back to the 'quia iam lucifer oritur,' not forward to the 'nisi quoniam.' It appears therefore that N. understood 'lucifer oritur' to be a mystical prophecy of the coming of Christ.

9. **incessu fidei...**] 'began to halt most seriously in the gait of its own faith and salvation, stumbling and slipping in its course.'

14. **uidens deum**] so Philo *de Abrah.* p. 358 Ἰσραὴλ ἑρμηνεύεται ὁρῶν Θεόν: an interpretation not accepted by the moderns: *v.* critical note.

17. **quamuis...**] 'though it was a man that he was holding in his grip.'

21. **intellegens iam uim...**] 'coming to perceive the meaning of the mystery, and penetrating to the majesty of Him with whom,' etc. For *sacramentum*, see note on p. 5. 8.

enim, inquit, *deum facie ad faciem, et salua facta est anima mea.* uidit autem deum, cum quo colluctatus est quasi cum homine: sed et hominem quidem quasi uictor tenuit, benedictionem autem quasi a deo, ut inferior, postulauit. ita cum deo et cum homine colluctatus fuit. ac si colluctatio haec ibi quidem praefigurata est, in euangelio autem inter Christum et populum Iacob perfecta est, in qua quamuis populus superior inuentus sit, minor repertus est dum nocens comprobatus est, quis dubitabit Christum, in quo haec colluctationis figura completa est, non hominem tantum sed et deum agnoscere, quandoquidem hominem illum et deum etiam figura ipsa colluctationis uideatur comprobasse?

Et tamen etiam post haec aeque non cessat eadem scriptura diuina angelum deum dicere, et deum angelum pronuntiare. nam cum Manassen atque Ephrem filios Ioseph benedicturus esset hic ipse Iacob, transuersis super capita puerorum manibus collocatis, *deus*, inquit, *qui pascit me a iuuentute mea usque in hunc diem, angelus qui liberauit me ex omnibus malis, benedicat pueros hos.* usque adeo autem eundem angelum ponit, quem deum dixerat, ut singulariter in exitu sermonis sui posuerit personam de qua loquebatur, dicendo *benedicat pueros hos.* si enim alterum deum, alterum angelum uoluisset intellegi, plurali numero duas personas complexus fuisset: nunc unius personae singularem numerum in benedictione deposuit; ex quo eundem deum atque angelum intellegi uoluit. sed enim deus pater accipi non potest: deus autem et angelus Christus accipi potest. quem ut huius benedictionis auctorem etiam transuersas super pueros manus Iacob ponendo significauit, quasi pater illorum esset Christus,

5 ac sic edd.: *cf. uero* pp. 59. 8, 63. 20. 14 et *ante* deum *ins.* We. 19 benedicat p. hos *ins.* Pa. *secutus* Fr. Junium. 22 alterum deum *ins.* We.

17. Gen. xlviii 15, 16.
20. **singulariter**] 'in the singular number.' For 'personam' *v.* Introd. § 6.
29. **quasi pater illorum esset Christus**] 'Implying that Christ was their father, so that he placed his hands in a way that foreshadowed the form and fashion of His passion.' The subjunctive 'poneret' shews

ex quo manus poneret figuram et formam futuram passionis ostendens. nemo igitur Christum, sicut angelum non dubitat dicere, ita etiam deum haesitet pronuntiare, cum hunc eundem in puerorum horum benedictionem per sacramentum passionis digestum in figura manuum et deum et angelum intellegat inuocatum fuisse.

20 XX. Ac si aliquis haereticus, pertinaciter obluctans aduersus ueritatem, uoluerit in his omnibus exemplis proprie angelum aut intellegere, aut intellegendum esse contenderit, in hoc quoque uiribus ueritatis frangatur necesse est. nam si omnibus caelestibus terrenis et infernis Christo subditis etiam ipsi angeli cum omnibus ceteris, quaecumque subiecta sunt, Christo dicuntur subditi, et tamen quiuis angelus subditus

1 poneret edd. Angl.: ponere priores. 3 *uerba* pronuntiare *usque ad finem capitis restituit* γ *ex* cod. Britannico [*sic* Ja]. 4 et Pa *al.*: in *emend.* We: ex...benedictione Ja. 7 ac si α: at si γ *al.* 9 contendere ms. Wow. *omissis uerbis* angelum...esse. 13 dicuntur dii, iure et deus Christus. et si Pa. subditi *ins.* Ja: et tamen Fr. Jun. Ja.

that the clause falls under the influence of 'quasi.' The argument is this: Jacob in invoking the blessing of God who is at the same time the Angel, crosses his hands as he lays them on the boys' heads, and by that mystical action indicates that it is Christ who is bestowing the blessing in his person. 'Quasi pater illorum esset Christus': it was naturally the father's office to bless. The idea that Christ was prefigured in the crossed hands is found in Tert. *de Bapt.* 8.

1. **ex quo manus**] Cp. Introd. § 2 iii on the dislocation of the following chapters in the old edd.

3. 'Since he perceives that He was invoked, for the blessing of these lads, as alike God and Angel, through the mysterious sign (*sacramentum*) of the passion given in the crossing of hands.'

XX. *But supposing the heretic contends that He is only an Angel: Angels, though subject to Christ, are called in Scripture gods, and therefore much more is Christ God. For what is true of the less is true of the greater. Again, Christ 'in the synagogue of the gods stood and judged the gods,' doing thus that which God is said to do. And Moses was made a 'god' to Pharaoh, though to him the name was given only in measure, to Christ above all measure and for all time.*

13. I accept Jackson's corrections in the text. Pamelius inserts *dii, iure et Deus Christus* after *dicuntur*, partly, he says, 'ex editione Gagnaei priori'; in which it is probably a sheer interpolation, as Gelenius omits it. But it only confuses the premisses of the argument, which runs thus: 'all things in heaven and earth and under the earth are subject to Christ, including the Angels: yet any Angel may be called a god; *a fortiori* then Christ is rightly called God.' The former premiss is based on Eph. i 22. The latter premiss partly on Ps. lxxxi (lxxxii) 1, quoted below.

Christo deus potest dici; et hoc si dicitur et sine blasphemia profertur; multo magis utique et hoc ipsi dei filio Christo competere potest, ut deus pronuntietur. si enim qui subiectus Christo angelus, deus promitur, multo magis et constantius Christus, cui sunt omnes angeli subiecti, deus esse dicetur. nec enim naturae congruit, ut quae minoribus concessa sunt, maioribus denegentur. ita si angelus Christo minor est, angelus autem deus dicitur, magis consequenter Christus deus esse dicitur, qui non uno sed omnibus angelis et maior et melior inuenitur. ac si *stetit deus in synagoga deorum, in medio autem deus deos discernit*; in synagoga autem aliquotiens Christus stetit; Christus ergo in synagoga deus stetit, diiudicans scilicet deos quibus dicit: *usquequo personas hominum accipitis?* accusans scilicet consequenter homines synagogae non exercentes iusta iudicia. porro si illi, qui reprehenduntur atque culpantur, propter aliquam tamen causam hoc nomen adipisci sine blasphemia uidentur, ut dii nuncupentur, multo magis utique hic deus habebitur, qui non tantum deus

3 quiuis subiectus *coni.* Ja. 9 dicetur *coni.* Ja.

8. **magis consequenter Christus deus esse dicitur**] 'it follows rather as a matter of course that Christ is said to be God.' The same use of *consequenter* 'by natural or proper consequence' occurs *infra* l. 14 and pp. 4. 4, 79. 9. Cp. also p. 56. 15.

10. At first sight, the argument in this chapter seems to us obsolete, turning as it does upon the Hebrew use of the word 'gods' to denote judges and others who by their office represent God before men, and upon the strangely literal interpretation of 'synagoga.' Yet it must be remembered that our Lord Himself used the argument from the word 'gods' (Jo. x 34—38) in controversy with the Jews. It might be said that in so doing He was merely using an *argumentum ad hominem*: a principle which has sometimes to be invoked to explain His utterances. But the Christian scholar will use this principle with extreme parsimony. In the present case, may it not be implied that where 'earthly power shews likest God's,' there is a real affinity and an anticipation of contact between the human and the Divine, which is only fully realised in the Incarnation? Cf. Perowne on Ps. lxxxii 6 and Westcott on Jo. x 36 'the Son of God': also quotation from M. Godet in Abp Alexander's *Witness of the Pss.*[2] p. 232 n. 'Biblical Monotheism has nothing in common with the cold dead Deism which Jewish orthodoxy had extracted from the sacred books.... Every theocratic function, exercised in the name of Jehovah who conferred it, placed him to whom it was confided in living relation with the Most High.'

13. Ps. lxxxi (lxxxii) 2 Vg. 'usquequo facies peccatorum sumitis?'

in synagoga deorum stetisse dicitur, sed etiam deos discernens et diiudicans ex eadem lectionis auctoritate aperitur. at si illi qui *tamquam unus de principibus cadunt* dii tamen nuncupantur, multo magis deus esse dicetur, qui non tantum tamquam unus ex principibus non cadit, sed ipsum quoque malitiae et auctorem et principem uincit. quae autem, malum, ratio est, ut cum legant hoc etiam Moysi nomen datum, dum dicitur, *deum te posui Pharaoni*, Christo negetur, qui non Pharaoni deus, sed uniuersae creaturae et dominus et deus constitutus esse reperitur? et in illo quidem hoc nomen temperate datum, in hoc profuse: in illo ad mensuram, in hoc supra omnem omnino mensuram (*non enim ad mensuram*, inquit, *dat filio pater: pater enim*, inquit, *diligit filium*): in illo ad tempus, in hoc sine tempore; diuini enim nominis potestatem et super omnia et in omne tempus accepit. quod si, qui unius hominis accepit potestatem, in hac exiguitate huius datae potestatis nomen tamen istud dei incunctanter consequitur, quanto magis qui in ipsum quoque Moysen habet potestatem, nominis istius auctoritatem consecutus esse credetur?

1 in synagoga *ins.* We. 2 reperitur *coni.* We.

2. **ex eadem lectionis auctoritate**] 'by the authority of the same passage.' For the form of expression cp. p. 16. 8 'legitimam proprietatem appellationis.'

3. Ps. lxxxi (lxxxii) 7.

6. **malum**] note on ch. xviii, p. 63. 18.

7. Exod. vii 1.

9. **constitutus**] sc. by the Father.

10. 'In the former case the name is given with a qualification, in the latter unreservedly.'

12. **non enim ad m.**] Jo. iii 34, 35.

16. **in hac exiguitate...**] 'in spite of the narrow confines of the power given him, attains to that name of a God without any question'; lit. 'without hesitation' on the part of the sacred writers.

XXI. *The Divine Majesty of Christ proved by other Scriptures: in which He speaks of the raising again of the temple of His Body and His taking up of His life again. Only the Word, the Image of the Invisible God, who came down to do the Father's will, could thus speak. If He is the First-begotten of all creation, He cannot be mere man, made after all creation. The Incarnation explains it: though before all creation, He assumes manhood. Neither His Manhood nor His Godhead is to be denied: the two natures are conjoined in Him. Therefore He is Mediator between God and man. There is also the passage Coloss.* ii 15, *which speaks of His stripping off the flesh; which He took again at the Resurrection. By the force of terms, He must have stripped off*

XXI. Et poteram quidem omnium scripturarum caeles- 21
tium euentilare tractatus, et ingentem circa istam speciem Christi diuinitatis, ut ita dixerim, siluam commouere: nisi quoniam non tam mihi contra hanc haeresim propositum est dicere, quam breuiter circa personam Christi regulam ueritatis aperire. quamuis tamen ad alia festinem, illud non arbitror praetermittendum, quod in euangelio dominus ad significantiam suae maiestatis expressit dicendo: *soluite templum hoc, et ego in triduo suscitabo illud*; aut quando in alio loco et alia parte pronuntiat: *potestatem habeo animam meam ponendi et rursus recipere eam: hoc enim mandatum accepi a patre.* quis est enim, qui dicit animam suam se posse ponere aut animam suam posse se rursum recuperare, quia hoc mandatum acceperit a patre? aut quis dicit destructum corporis sui templum resuscitare rursum et reaedificare se posse? nisi quoniam sermo ille, qui *ex patre*, qui *apud patrem*, *per quem facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil*, imitator paternorum operum atque

something other than Himself: i.e. He (the Word) is not man only, but wears the vesture of humanity. And so Gen. xlix 11 *is mystically explained.*

1. 'I might indeed very well winnow the statements of all the heavenly Scriptures, and, if I may so say, stir a whole forest in the matter of that question of Christ's Divinity.' For *euentilare* cp. Tert. *de Fuga* 1 'pala illa, quae et nunc dominicam aream purgat,...confusum aceruum fidelium euentilans.' The idea of winnowing suggests that of 'stirring up a heap,' i.e. (in this case) 'sifting the teaching of many texts': *silua* denoting simply 'a crowded mass.' For *silua* in a literary sense cp. Statius' collection of poems called *Siluae*, and Lord Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* (a collection of natural phenomena). A close parallel is Tert. *adu. Prax.* xx 'pauca quae in silua inueniri possunt,' of the 'forest' of Scripture from which the heretics pick two or three texts.

2. **istam speciem**] It is difficult to define the sense of 'species' here. In Latin philosophy *species* stands for the Platonic 'idea': e.g. Cic. *Acad.* i 30 'hanc illi ἰδέαν appellant, iam a Platone ita nominatam, nos recte speciem possumus dicere.' Thus the word might mean 'notion,' 'belief,' 'view.' But it has also a legal sense, a 'case to be argued'; as in Plin. *Ep.* x 64 'haec quoque species incidit in cognitionem meam': and hence we might explain it here as a 'question' of doctrine to be discussed.

8. Jo. ii 19 Vulg. 'et in tribus diebus excitabo illud': and below, Jo. x 18 Vulg. 'potestatem habeo ponendi eam et potestatem habeo iterum sumendi eam.'

15. **sermo ille**] is taken up below, after the qualifying clauses, by *hic Christus* (77. 6).

16. Jo. i 3.

17. **imitator paternorum operum**] Jo. v 19 foll.

uirtutum, *imago inuisibilis dei*, qui *descendit de caelo*, qui *quae uidit et audiuit testificatus est*, qui *non uenit ut faceret suam uoluntatem, sed* potius *ut faciat patris uoluntatem*, a quo missus ad hoc ipsum fuerat, ut *magni consilii angelus* factus arcanorum caelestium nobis iura reseraret, quique *uerbum caro factus habitauit in nobis*, ex nobis hic Christus non homo tantum, quia hominis filius, sed etiam deus, quia dei filius, comprobatur.

Quod si et *primogenitus omnis creaturae* ab apostolo dictus sit Christus, quomodo omnis creaturae primogenitus esse potuit, nisi quoniam secundum diuinitatem ante omnem creaturam ex patre deo sermo processit? quod nisi ita haeretici acceperint, Christum hominem primogenitum omnis creaturae monstrare cogentur; quod facere non poterunt. aut igitur ante omnem est creaturam, ut primogenitus sit omnis creaturae, et non homo est tantum, quia homo post omnem creaturam est: aut homo tantum est, et est post omnem creaturam. et quomodo primogenitus est omnis creaturae, nisi secundum uerbum illud quod est ante creaturam? et ideo primogenitus omnis creaturae caro fit et habitat in nobis, hoc est, assumit hunc hominem qui est post omnem creaturam, et sic cum illo

6 qua hominis...qua dei *coni.* Fr. Jun. 17 nisi secundum *nos coni.*: nisi quoniam dum edd.

1. Col. i 15: Jo. iii. 31, 32: vi 38.

4, 5. Is. ix 6 (LXX): Jo. i 14.

6. **ex nobis**] refers to the Human Nature, answering to *ex Patre* above.

8. **primogenitus** cet.] πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως: *v.* Lightfoot *l.c.*, who quotes Justin Martyr *Dial.* § 100 πρωτότοκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων. The ideas of priority and sovereignty are combined, as in Ps. lxxxviii (lxxxix) 27. 'All the fathers of the second and third centuries, so far as I have noticed, refer it to the Eternal Word and not to the Incarnate Christ,' Lightfoot, in approval, quoting this among other passages (Tertull. *adu. Prax.* 7, Hippol. *Haer.* x 33 etc.). It was the Arians who subsequently inferred from the expression that the Son was a created being: and many of the Fathers were led away by controversy into the false exegesis, that it describes the Incarnate Christ, the κτίσις thus denoting the spiritual creation.

17. Previous editions read *quoniam dum*, in place of which I conjecture *secundum*: which may be supported by p. 49. 19 'non est ex hoc mundo secundum uerbi diuinitatem.' The uncorrected text can only be rendered by making 'hoc est' introduce the apodosis, and treating 'et ideo primogenitus omnis creaturae' as a parenthesis.

20. **post omnem creaturam**] Gen. i 26 foll.

et in illo habitat in nobis, ut neque homo Christo subtrahatur, neque diuinitas negetur. nam si tantummodo ante omnem creaturam est, homo in illo subtractus est. si autem tantummodo homo est, diuinitas quae ante omnem creaturam est intercepta est. utrumque ergo in Christo confoederatum est, et utrumque coniunctum est, et utrumque conexum est, et merito, dum est in illo aliquid quod superat creaturam, pignerata in illo diuinitatis et humanitatis uidetur esse concordia. propter quam causam, qui *mediator dei et hominum* effectus exprimitur, in se deum et hominem sociasse reperitur.

Ac si idem apostolus de Christo refert, ut *exutus carnem potestates dehonestauit, palam triumphatis illis in semetipso*, non utique otiose exutum carne proposuit, nisi quoniam et in resurrectione rursum indutum uoluit intellegi. quis est ergo iste exutus et rursus indutus? requirant haeretici. nos enim sermonem dei scimus indutum carnis substantiam, eundemque rursum exutum eadem corporis materia, quam rursus in resurrectione suscepit et quasi indumentum resumpsit. sed enim neque exutus neque indutus hominem Christus fuisset, si homo

8 humilitatis γ Pa : *corr.* Fr. Jun. 13 et resurrectionem γ Pa : *corr.* Ja.

5. **intercepta**] 'invalidated': cf. p. 60. 8 'nec noui testamenti intercepta sit potestas,' with note.

9. 1 Tim. ii 5.

11. Col. ii 15 Vulg. 'exspolians principatus et potestates traduxit confidenter, palam triumphans illos in semetipso.' Vetus Itala has *exuens se*, a more correct rendering of ἀπεκδυσάμενος. According to Lightfoot, the Latin Fathers generally interpreted it as 'putting off [the body]': thus, like Novatian, Hilar. *de Trin.* i 13 has 'exutus carnem': cp. R.V. margin. The rendering of R.V. 'having put off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly' (which represents the view of the Greek Fathers) presents much difficulty. Bp Moule (*Camb. Gk Test.*) defends A.V. 'having spoiled' for Himself 'principalities.' More is to be said for the rendering of the Latins than Lightfoot allows, when he speaks of 'an isolated metaphor which is not explained or suggested by anything in the context': τῷ σταυρῷ, the preceding words, might *suggest* 'stripping for a contest.'

12. **in semetipso**] but the Greek has ἐν αὐτῷ, 'in it,' and so the Greek Fathers, rightly.

ib. **non utique otiose**] 'in a merely purposeless way': *utique* after a negative 'simply' or 'at all'; as in p. 18. 5 'non utique ex coagmentis corporalibus,' p. 48. 1 'non utique homo tantum est.'

tantum fuisset. nemo enim umquam se ipso aut spoliatur aut induitur. sit enim necesse est aliud, quicquid aliunde aut spoliatur aut induitur. ex quo merito sermo dei fuit, qui exutus est carnem et in resurrectione rursus indutus; exutus autem, quoniam et in natiuitate fuerat indutus. itaque in Christo deus est qui induitur, atque etiam exutus sit oportet: propterea quod is qui induitur, pariter et exuatur necesse est. induitur autem et exuitur homine, quasi quadam contexti corporis tunica. ac propterea consequenter sermo fuit, ut diximus, dei, qui modo indutus, modo exutus esse reperitur. hoc enim etiam in benedictionibus ante praedixit: *lauabit stolam suam in uino, et in sanguine uuae amictum suum.* si stola in Christo caro est, et amictum ipsum corpus est, requiratur, quis est ille cuius corpus amictum est, et stola caro? nobis enim manifestum est carnem stolam et corpus amictum uerbi fuisse, qui uuae sanguine, id est uino, lauit substantiam corporis et materiam carnis, abluens ex parte suscepti hominis passione. ex quo siquidem lauatur, homo est, quia amictum, quod lauatur, caro est: qui autem lauat, uerbum dei est, qui ut lauaret

7 quod *nos inserimus.* 8 homine] homo edd. 12 et in sanguine uuae amictum suum *ins.* *a.* 13 amictus ipse γ G: -um ipsum *a.* *Sic* p. 80. 1 -tus γ G: -ti *a.* quisquis *priores corr.* We. 16 quique sanguine γ Pa ('locus obscurus et quantum apparet mutilus aut corruptus' Pa): qui uuae s. *corr.* We: qui in sanguine Fr. Jun. 17 et m. c. abluens γ Pa. abluit *coni.* We.

2. 'It must needs be something else, which is either divested of a thing or invested in it.' 'Aliunde' is contrasted with 'se ipso,' and is regarded as an abl. case of the pronoun, equivalent to 'alia re.' It only applies in strictness to the 'spoliatur,' not to 'induitur.'

9. **consequenter**] see n. on p. 74. 8.

11. **lauabit stolam** cet.] Gen. xlix 11, where Vulg. has 'pallium suum.' For the rare neuter 'amictum,' cp. Isid. *Orig.* 19. 24. 15 'mantum Hispani uocant quod manus tegat tantum, est enim breue amictum.'

17. **abluens ex parte** cet.] 'in regard of the manhood which He took upon Him, cleansing it by His Passion': cp. *amicti susceptor* below. The *amictum* is the *homo* or 'human nature.' The passage is similarly applied in Hippol. *de Antichr.* xi αἵματι οὖν σταφυλῆς, ποίας ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ὡς βότρυος ἐπὶ ξύλου βληθείσης; and Tertull. *adu. Marc.* iv 40. For a different turn to the explanation see Justin *Dial.* 54, 63, 76; *Apol.* i 32; repeated by Irenaeus εἰς ἐνδ. 57; *Haer.* IV XX 2: Cypr. *Ep.* lxiii 6.

amictum, amicti susceptor effectus est. merito ex ea substantia, quae recepta est ut lauaretur, homo exprimitur, sic ut ex uerbi auctoritate, qui lauit, deus esse monstretur.

XXII. Cur autem, licet ad aliam partem disputandi 22
festinare uideamur, illum praetereamus apud apostolum locum? *qui cum in forma dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est aequalem se deo esse; sed semetipsum exinaniuit, formam serui accipiens, in similitudine hominum factus, et habitu inuentus ut homo: humiliauit se, oboediens factus usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis: propterea et deus illum superexaltauit, et dedit illi nomen quod est super omne nomen; ut in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur caelestium terrestrium et infernorum, et omnis lingua confiteatur, quoniam dominus Iesus in gloria est dei patris. qui cum in forma dei esset,* inquit. si homo tantummodo Christus, in imagine dei, non *in forma dei* relatus fuisset. hominem enim scimus ad imaginem, non ad formam dei factum. quis ergo est iste, qui *in forma dei*, ut diximus, factus est angelus? sed nec in angelis formam dei

2 sic ut...monstretur γ: sicut...monstratur Pa. 14 si homo α: sin homo *al.*

XXII. *Lastly, St Paul's teaching in Philipp.* ii 6—11 *must be examined. Christ is in the form of God, whereas man is only made in the image of God. He has proceeded from the Father, in the form of God, that He may be God of all.*

Yet He did not 'grasp at equality with the Father,' remembering that He has His Sonship by gift of the Father. He rendered all obedience to the Father: and accepted human frailty by His birth. Thus He emptied Himself. This could not be said of a mere man, who would be enriched, not emptied, by the fact of birth. The authority of the Divine Word sinks itself for the time in taking Manhood. His immediate reward was the Name which is above every name.

6. The quotation keeps closer than Vulg. to the Greek in reading *in similitudine* (not *-em*), and *superexaltauit* (Vulg. *exaltauit*) for ὑπερύψωσε.

17. **quis ergo est iste, qui in forma dei, ut diximus, factus est angelus**] 'What angel is this, who was made in the form of God?' The word 'angelus' is separated from 'iste' merely for the sake of emphatic contrast with 'hominem': and the words 'factus est' are applicable only in conjunction with 'angelus.' Angels are 'made'; N. asks whether any angel has been made on so exalted a plane of being.

18. **nec in angelis**] 'not even,' as in p. 15. 21. 'Nisi quoniam' introduces the actual fact, 'but the truth is that' etc. Cp. n. on p. 64. 13.

legimus; nisi quoniam hic praecipuus atque generosus prae omnibus dei filius, uerbum dei, imitator omnium paternorum operum, dum et ipse operatur sicut et pater eius, in forma (ut expressimus) est dei patris. et merito in forma pronuntiatus est dei, dum et ipse super omnia, et omnis creaturae diuinam obtinens potestatem, et deus est exemplo patris; hoc ipsum tamen a patre proprio consecutus, ut omnium et deus esset, et dominus esset, et deus ad formam dei patris ex ipso genitus atque prolatus. hic ergo quamuis *esset in forma dei, non est rapinam arbitratus aequalem se deo esse.* quamuis enim se ex deo patre deum esse meminisset, numquam se deo patri aut comparauit aut contulit, memor se esse ex suo patre, et hoc ipsum, quod est, habere se, quia pater dedisset. inde denique et ante carnis assumptionem, sed et post assumptionem corporis, post ipsam praeterea resurrectionem, omnem patri in omnibus rebus oboedientiam praestitit pariter ac praestat. ex quo probatur numquam arbitratum illum esse rapinam quandam diuinitatem, ut aequaret se patri deo: quin immo contra, omni ipsius imperio et uoluntati oboediens atque subiectus,

2. **imitator**] John v 19 foll. Cp. ch. xxi, p. 76 l. 17.

4. 'And occupying Divine power over every creature, is also God like His Father, having however received this [honour] from His own Father that He should be both God and Lord of all, and God in the form of God His Father, begotten and produced from Him.' For 'prolatus' cp. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* p. 285 D τοῦτο τὸ τῷ ὄντι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῷ πατρί (quoted by Bp Bull *Def. F. N.* pt ii p. 728); also Tertull. *adu. Prax.* c. viii 'protulit deus sermonem,' in contrast to the heretical use of προβολή by Valentinus the Gnostic; also *Apol.* 21 'ex deo prolatum...et prolatione generatum et idcirco filium dei et deum dictum ex unitate substantiae.'

12. **et hoc ipsum**] a strong assertion of the subordination of the Son: 'and that He has what He is simply by the Father's gift.' *v.* Introd. § 3.

16. **ex quo probatur** sq.] 'that He never regarded His Divinity as a form of grasping, that He should equal Himself with God the Father: on the contrary,' etc. This passage taken in connexion with the passage cited in ll. 9, 10, certainly seems to shew that N. understands *rapinam* (ἁρπαγμόν) in a sense which is rather that of our A.V. ('robbery,' i.e. usurpation) than that of our R.V. ('a prize,' marg. 'a thing to be grasped'), though the general sense of the passage corresponds with the R.V. The clause 'ut aequaret se patri deo,' answers to 'aequalem se deo esse' in the citation, and is evidently intended as an interpretation of 'rapinam,' which in either case is the grammatical predicate.

etiam ut formam serui susciperet contentus fuit—hoc est, hominem illum fieri—et substantiam carnis et corporis, quam ex paternorum secundum hominem delictorum seruitute uenientem nascendo suscepit. quo tempore se etiam exinaniuit, dum humanam condicionis fragilitatem suscipere non recusauit. quoniam si homo tantummodo natus fuisset, per hoc exinanitus non esset. homo enim nascens augetur, non exinanitur: nam dum incipit esse quod cum non esset habere non potuit, ut diximus, non exinanitur, sed potius augetur atque ditatur. at si Christus exinanitur in eo quod nascitur, formam serui accipiendo, quomodo homo tantummodo est? de quo uerius dictum fuisset, locupletatum illum esse tunc cum nasceretur, non exinanitum: nisi quoniam auctoritas diuini uerbi, ad suscipiendum hominem interim conquiescens, nec se suis uiribus exercens, deicit se ad tempus atque deponit, dum

3 paternorum et *edd.* 9 at si γ: ac si α.

N. understands the text to mean, "He did not think His Divinity ('in forma dei esse') an equality with God, which would have been a usurpation," or arrogation to Himself of that which was not His. The force of *rapinam* can only be fixed by the context. But in Tertull. also, *adu. Prax.* vii, it seems to be taken in the same sense, as generally by the Latin Fathers (Lightfoot, *ad l.c.*).

1. **hoc est, hominem illum fieri**] is perhaps a gloss, as the introduction of the emphatic *illum* may be thought to shew. It breaks the flow of the sentence. If it is to stand, the 'et substantiam' which follows must be coupled to 'formam,' not to 'hominem.'

2. **quam ex paternorum** sq.] 'which He took upon Him by His birth, as it came to Him from the servitude of the sins of His forefathers according to His manhood:' N. evidently understands the 'forma serui' to be connected with sin and the loss of true freedom which it involves. Doubtless St Paul intended it to denote the position of a creature, without any reference to sin. It would not be easy to reconcile N.'s language with the usual belief of Christendom with regard to the sinlessness of the humanity assumed by Christ. But perhaps he did not mean to assert that the humanity as actually assumed by Christ was in a state of sinful servitude, but only that it 'came' to Him from those who were in such a state.

13. **nisi quoniam auctoritas...**] 'but in fact the majesty of the Divine Word, condescending for the time being to take Manhood upon Him, and not putting forth His full powers, lowers and brings Himself down for a time, while bearing the humanity which He has taken upon Him.' On this self-limitation of the Incarnation (or 'a ceasing to exercise certain natural prerogatives of the divine existence') *v.* Bp Gore, *Bampton Lectures* vi p. 158 sq., *Dissertations* i § 2 p. 88, 89, 90, referring to 2 Cor. viii 9. For 'interim' cp. p. 50 l. 10. For 'exercens' Latinius read *exserens*, 'putting out.'

hominem fert quem suscepit. exinanit se, dum ad iniurias contumeliasque descendit, dum audit infanda, experitur indigna. cuius tamen humilitatis adest statim egregius fructus. accepit enim *nomen, quod est super omne nomen*, quod utique non aliud intellegimus esse quam nomen dei. nam cum dei sit solius esse super omnia, consequens est, ut nomen illud quod est super omne nomen sit eius, qui super omnia est. dei est ergo nomen illud quod super omne nomen est: quod nomen est eius utique consequenter, qui, cum in forma dei fuisset, non rapinam arbitratus est aequalem se deo esse. neque enim si non deus esset Christus, omne se in nomine eius genu flecteret, caelestium et terrestrium et infernorum: nec uisibilia aut inuisibilia, aut rerum omnium omnis creatura homini esset subiecta siue substrata, quae se ante hominem esse meminisset. ex quo dum *in forma dei* esse Christus dicitur, et dum in natiuitatem secundum carnem se exinanisse monstratur, et dum id accepisse nomen a patre quod sit super omne nomen exprimitur, et dum in nomine eius omne genu caelestium, terrenorum et infernorum se flectere et curuare monstratur, et hoc ipsum in gloriam dei patris succurrere asseritur; consequenter non ex illo tantum homo est, quia *oboediens* patri *factus est usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis*; sed ex his etiam rebus superioribus

1 exinanit γ G: -ivit Pa. 6, 7 nomen illud sit super omne quod est eius qui super omnia est *edd. priores*: *ordinem uerborum restituimus, inserto uerbo* nomen. 7 *post* dei *interpungunt* edd. priores. 15 natiuitate We. 20 sui decurrere Fr. Jun.: succedere *vel* sui cedere Ja.

5. The argument of this very prolix passage is: God is above all things, therefore God's Name is above all other names: therefore that is the Name which Christ has received—the Name which properly belonged to Him before His Incarnation.

15. **in natiuitatem**] 'to the point of birth after the flesh.'

19. **in gloriam dei patris succurrere**] 'to redound to the glory of God.' This paraphrase of the closing words of the quotation brings them into accord with εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός of the Greek. The word *succurrere* used in this sense is difficult to parallel; unless perhaps in its medical sense, 'to be useful': Plin. 31. 10 'nitrum succurrit et uenenis fungorum.'

20. **ex illo...quia**] 'from the fact that.' The 'tantum' goes with 'homo,' not with 'ex illo.'

22. 'From these foregoing proofs which declare the Divinity

diuinitatem Christi sonantibus, dominus Christus Iesus et deus, quod haeretici nolunt, esse monstratur.

XXIII. Hoc in loco licebit mihi argumenta etiam ex 23
aliorum haereticorum parte conquirere. firmum est genus probationis, quod etiam ab aduersario sumitur, ut ueritas etiam ab ipsis inimicis ueritatis probetur. nam usque adeo hunc manifestum est in scripturis esse et deum tradi, ut plerique haereticorum, diuinitatis ipsius magnitudine et ueritate commoti, ultra modum extendentes honores eius, ausi sint non filium sed ipsum deum patrem promere uel putare. quod, etsi contra scripturarum ueritatem est, tamen diuinitatis Christi argumentum grande atque praecipuum est; qui usque adeo deus, sed qua filius dei natus ex deo, ut plerique illum (ut diximus) haeretici ita deum acceperint, ut non filium sed patrem pronuntiandum putarint. aestiment ergo an hic sit deus, cuius auctoritas tantum mouit quosdam, ut putarent illum, ut diximus superius, iam ipsum patrem deum, effrenatius et

7 esse et] et γ: esse G Pa. 13 deus est *coni.* We. 15 aestiment ergo...sit deus *suppl. ex a* Pa.

of Christ,' referring to the substance of p. 83 lines 14—20.

XXIII. *He adverts to other heresies. The enemy of the truth sometimes provides its best proofs. The Patripassians are so much impressed by the truth of Christ's Divinity, that they have gone too far and identify Him with God the Father. The Docetic Gnostics, fearing to evacuate His Divinity by uniting it with a human nativity, deny the true Manhood. In either heresy we find an argument for the truth of His Divinity. Holy Scripture states the faith in its true proportion. In the Word made Flesh, heaven and earth are braced together, God being united to men and men to God. The Son of God is made Man by the Incarnation: the Son of Man is made God by receiving God the Word. This is the mystery appointed before the ages for the salvation of mankind.*

4. **firmum est** sq.] The Antwerp editor Pamelius illustrates copiously this opinion that 'the truth may be confirmed by the testimony of heretics,' quoting Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vii 6, Origen *Hom.* ix, Jerome *Epist.* 75; but is careful to add that 'as no one is a judge in his own cause (sapiat in propria causa),' Pope Pius IV drew up the Index of interdicted books for all except those 'uiri doctissimi' in whose favour the apostolic see makes an exception.

10. **promere uel putare**] 'to express or at least to hold the opinion that' etc.

12. **argumentum grande atque praecipuum**] It is, in truth, one of the most acute of N.'s arguments.

13. **plerique haeretici**] as the Sabellians: already referred to (*ut diximus*) in ch. xii.

17. **effrenatius... confitentes...**] 'confessing Divinity in Christ without limit or reserve, constrained to

effusius in Christo diuinitatem confitentes, ad hoc illos manifesta Christi diuinitate cogente, ut, quem filium legerent, quia deum animaduerterent, patrem putarent. alii quoque haeretici usque adeo Christi manifestam amplexati sunt diuinitatem, ut dixerint illum fuisse sine carne, et totum illi susceptum detraxerint hominem, ne decoquerent in illo diuini nominis potestatem, si humanam illi sociassent, ut arbitrabantur, natiuitatem. quod tamen nos non probamus; sed argumentum afferimus usque adeo Christum esse deum, ut quidam illum, subtracto homine, tantummodo putarint deum, quidam autem ipsum crediderint patrem deum: cum ratio et temperamentum scripturarum caelestium Christum ostendant deum, sed qua filium dei, et, assumpto a deo etiam filio hominis, credendum et hominem. quoniam si ad hominem ueniebat, ut mediator dei et hominum

1 confiteri Pa: tantum mouit quosdam effrenatius et eff. in C. diuin. confiteri, ut putarent Ja *corr.*, *alioqui* confitentes.

it by His manifest Divinity, so that though they read of Him as the Son, perceiving His Godhead, they came to regard Him as the Father.' (I accept the emendation *confitentes*.) The words *effrenatius et effusius* repeat the idea of 'ultra modum extendentes honores eius ausi sint' above, implying a devotional feeling which has outrun dogmatic caution ('ratio et temperamentum scripturarum'). The words 'ut... putarent' depend on the general sense of the participial clauses 'effrenatius...cogente.'

6. **decoquerent**] 'evacuate.' For this use, cp. Quintil. ii 4 'multum inde decoquent anni, multum ratio limabit.' These *alii haeretici* were those attacked by Tertullian in his *de Carne Christi*,—of the Gnostic school, with its disparagement of the material. Basilides of Alexandria (A.D. 117—138) regarded the Passion as the reclaiming of Christ's spiritual nature from the corporeal and psychical: Valentinus taught at Rome A.D. 137 to 154, representing Christ as an aeon or emanation from Deity, who having merely an apparent body did not really suffer: Marcion, at Rome A.D. 140 to 155, held a similar docetic view.

7. **natiuitatem**] Thus Marcion held that Christ was not born at all, but suddenly descended into the city of Capernaum in the 15th year of Tiberius to reveal God to man.

11. **cum ratio** cet.] 'whereas the proportion and reserve of the heavenly Scriptures shew Christ to be God, as being the Son of God: and that He must be believed to be also Man, in that the Son of man has been taken into the Godhead.' **N.** refers (*a*) to the Patripassian heresy; and (*b*) to the Docetic heresies, respectively aforenamed. Cp. p. 19. 14 'rationem enim diuinae scripturae de temperamento dispositionis cognoscimus,' and Rom. xii 6 (Vulg.) 'secundum rationem fidei.'

14. **ut mediator dei et hominum esse deberet**] 'that He might be the mediator.' This is an example of that pleonastic, almost auxiliary, use of *debere* which is common in later

esse deberet, oportuit illum cum eo esse, et uerbum carnem fieri, ut in semetipso concordiam confibularet terrenorum pariter atque caelestium, dum utriusque partis in se conectens pignora et deum homini et hominem deo copularet; ut merito filius dei per assumptionem carnis filius hominis, et filius hominis per receptionem dei uerbi filius dei effici possit. hoc altissimum atque reconditum sacramentum, ad salutem generis humani ante saecula destinatum, in domino Iesu Christo deo et homine inuenitur impleri, quo condicio generis humani ad fructum aeternae salutis posset adduci.

XXIV. Sed erroris istius haereticorum inde, ut opinor, 24
nata materia est, quia inter filium dei et filium hominis nihil arbitrantur interesse, ne facta distinctione et homo et deus Iesus Christus facile comprobetur. eundem enim atque

Latin. See Goelzer *Latinité de S. Jérôme* p. 417. It is especially common in Gregory the Great; e.g. *Ep.* lib. VI ind. xiv num. 7 'ut quos morituros conspexerit, debeat baptizare': lib. XI ind. iv num. 66 'haec signa de fine saeculi praemittuntur, ut de animabus nostris debeamus esse solliciti.' The same kind of use recurs below, ch. xxiv p. 90. 9.

2. **confibularet,** 'clench,' or 'brace together.' Cp. c. xxiv *ad fin.* and *de Cib. Iud.* v 'fibula caritatis mutuis membris innexum.'

3. **utriusque partis...pignora]** The idea is that man and God have entered into a mutual engagement, of which the Incarnation is the guarantee. Cp. p. 78. 7, 8 'pignerata in illo diuinitatis et humanitatis uidetur esse concordia.'

7. **sacramentum]** cp. p. 5 l. 8 note, Eph. i 11 (Vulg.) 'sacramentum uoluntatis suae.'

8. **ante saecula]** 2 Tim. i 9 (Vulg.) 'ante tempora saecularia.'

9. **condicio generis humani]** 'the lowly estate of human nature,' as in p. 25. 4.

XXIV. *The heretics have failed to distinguish the Son of God from the Son of Man. They make out that Man in his frail substance is the same as the Son of God, supporting their view by placing their own meaning on the words of the Annunciation that the Son of God is of the substance of Mary. But it is only necessary to look carefully into the text: it is not primarily but in the second instance that the Child of Mary is Son of God. In the first instance, the Son of God is the Word of God, who became incarnate through the Spirit. He it is who takes upon Himself that Son of Man and by the union of Natures makes Him Son of God. The primary application of the name 'Son of God' is limited to Him who descends: in its secondary force, it is the 'Son of Man united with Him.' Therefore the Angel duly distinguished the Natures. Thus the Son of Man holds as it were on loan that which by His own nature He could not hold, the position of Son of God. There is a distinction and yet an association: Christ Jesus the Lord is Man and God.*

For the Christology of this passage see Introduction § 5, pp. li, lii, liv.

14. **eundem atque ipsum]** 'the selfsame,' here the predicate: 'they

ipsum, id est hominem filium hominis etiam filium dei, uolunt uideri, ut homo et caro et fragilis illa substantia eadem atque ipse filius dei esse dicatur; ex quo, dum distinctio filii hominis et filii dei nulla secernitur, sed ipse filius hominis dei filius uindicatur, homo tantummodo Christus idem atque filius dei asseratur. per quod nituntur excludere: *uerbum caro factum est et habitauit in nobis;* et *uocabitis nomen eius Emmanuel, quod est interpretatum nobiscum deus.*

Proponunt enim atque illa praetendunt, quae in euangelio Lucae relata sunt, ex quibus asserere conantur, non quod est, sed tantum illud quod uolunt esse: *spiritus sanctus ueniet in te, et uirtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi; propterea et quod ex te nascetur sanctum, uocabitur filius dei.* si ergo, inquiunt, angelus dei dicit ad Mariam, *quod ex te nascetur sanctum,* ex Maria est substantia carnis et corporis. hanc autem substantiam, id est sanctum hoc quod ex illa genitum est, filium dei esse proposuit. homo, inquiunt, ipse, et illa caro corporis, illud quod sanctum est dictum, ipsum est filius dei; ut et cum dicit scriptura *sanctum,* Christum filium hominis hominem intellegamus, et cum *filium dei* proponit, non deum sed hominem percipere debeamus.

16 filium dei esse proposuit *ex a suppl.* Pa. 20 non hominem sed deum Pa: *corr.* edd. Angl.

wish Him to appear the selfsame person.' Thus p. 98 l. 10 'quis non intellegat...non eundem atque ipsum Apollo pariter et Paulum?'

5. **homo tantummodo...**] 'the mere man Christ is asserted to be the same as the Son of God.'

9. **proponunt** sq.] 'affirm and allege in support of it the statement in the Gospel of Luke,' sc. in i 35.

11. Vulg. has 'Sp. sanctus superueniet in te...ideoque et quod nascetur ex te sanctum.'

13. **si ergo, inquiunt...**] The premisses of this argument are (*a*) that 'that holy thing' is only the substance of flesh derived from Mary: (*b*) that the angel affirmed (*proposuit*) that holy thing to be the Son of God. The conclusion drawn by the heretics is, that the offspring of Mary is itself the Son of God and that therefore the title of Son of God is inexactly used. The logical, as distinguished from the grammatical, apodosis begins at *homo, inquiunt.*

18 foll. **ut et cum...**] The words in any case represent the 'heretical' statement. It is simplest, with the English editors, to read *non deum sed hominem*: in which case *percipere debeamus* denotes the view thus forced upon us, that the 'Son of God' is really mere man. For *filium dei proponit* cp. ll. 16, 17 'sanctum hoc...filium dei esse proposuit.'

Sed enim scriptura diuina haereticorum et fraudes et furta facile conuincit et detegit. si enim sic esset tantummodo: *spiritus ueniet in te, et uirtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi; propterea quod nascetur ex te sanctum, uocabitur filius dei*, fortasse alio esset nobis genere aduersus illos reluctandum, et alia nobis essent argumenta quaerenda et arma sumenda, quibus illorum et insidias et praestigias uinceremus. cum autem ipsa scriptura caelesti abundans plenitudine sese haereticorum istorum calumniis exuat, facile ipso quod scriptum est nitimur, et errores istos sine ulla dubitatione superamus. non enim dixit, ut iam expressimus, *propterea quod ex te nascetur sanctum*, sed adiecit coniunctionem: ait enim, *propterea et quod ex te nascetur sanctum;* ut illud ostenderet, non principaliter hoc sanctum, quod ex illa nascitur, id est istam carnis corporisque substantiam, filium dei esse, sed consequenter et in secundo loco: principaliter autem filium dei esse uerbum dei incarnatum per illum spiritum, de quo angelus refert: *spiritus ueniet in te, et uirtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi.*

Hic est enim legitimus dei filius, qui ex ipso deo est, qui dum

13 *uerba* non principaliter *usque ad* principaliter autem *ex a suppl.* Pa: *nimirum a priore ed. exclusa ut haeresim sonantia. Sic quoque* p. 90. 8 ut hominis filium *usque ad* dei et hominis filium.

4. **alio...genere**] 'in another sort' or 'way.' For this use of 'genus' see Mayor *Journal of Philology* xxix 147; Souter *Study of Ambrosiaster* 107 f.

7. **praestigias**] properly 'sleight-of-hand,' i.e. 'sophistries.'

11. Of course this argument, resting on the presence of the conjunction *et*, is not a safe one; for we find the combination διὸ καί in numberless cases where the καί cannot be pressed, e.g. Acts x 29. N. does not seem to have contemplated the possibility of treating *sanctum* as predicate.

13. **principaliter...consequenter et in secundo loco**] 'primarily' or 'immediately'...'inferentially and in the secondary place.' So below *principalitas* (p. 89 l. 4), 'originality' or 'primary ground.'

ib. **hoc sanctum** sq.] Though N. appears in these words to limit the 'thing' which was born of Mary to the bodily organism, in p. 89 l. 1 he seems to attribute to it a human personality.

19. 'For this is the Son of God in the proper sense (*legitimus*) who is from God Himself; and in assuming that "holy thing" and attaching to Himself the Son of Man and drawing Him over to Himself, He does by blending and association with Himself certify Him.' *Praestat*, properly 'guarantees,' κυροῖ. Cp. *de Trin.* xv 'uerbum Christi praestat immortalitatem et per immortalitatem praestat diuinitatem': *de Cib. Iud.* ii 'culpae

sanctum istud assumit et sibi filium hominis annectit et illum ad se rapit atque transducit, conexione sua et permixtione sociata praestat, et filium illum dei facit, quod ille naturaliter non fuit; ut principalitas nominis istius *filius dei* in spiritu sit domini, qui descendit et uenit; ut sequella nominis in filio dei et hominis sit, et merito consequenter hic filius dei factus

5 ut] et? 6 dei et *om.* We: filius dei in homine *coni.* Ja: filius dei filii hominis *ego malim.*

graui inruitur, si terrestris et humana sacris et spiritalibus litteris doctrina praestatur.' However it may be that the clause 'et filium dei facit' is misplaced, and that *praestat* governs the clause *quod... non fuit* 'gives Him what He was not by nature and makes Him Son of God.'

3. **quod ille naturaliter non fuit**] 'The doctrine is precisely the same as in the Spanish Adoptianists of the time of Charlemagne; even in the expressions used, there is but a slight shade of difference, when Novatian refuses to recognise in Mary's son the *legitimus* filius dei.' So Ammundsen p. 38, agreeing with Harnack (*D. G.*^{3} i 587 n.), and comparing Hermas *Sim.* v 6, who thus writes as to the Son of God, the 'seruus' in the 'similitude': 'uides igitur esse dominum populi, accepta a patre suo omni potestate,' and again, 'in consilio aduocauit ergo filium et nuntios bonos, ut et huic scilicet corpori, quod seruisset spiritui sancto sine querella, locus aliquis consistendi daretur, ne uideretur mercedem seruitutis suae perdidisse.'

4. **ut principalitas ... hominis sit**] The passage, though difficult, may be so rendered as to give a sense consistent with that of the preceding passage in ll. 13 (p. 88) to 4 (p. 89). The words 'domini,' 'et hominis,' are predicates. For the phrase 'qui descendit et uenit' qualifying the former, cp. line 38 'probans quoniam filius dei descendit.' In line 26 'hic' refers to 'hominis.' It is more difficult to deal with 'in spiritu,' 'in filio dei.' For 'in spiritu' we must refer to p. 88. 16 'incarnatum per illum spiritum,' and, for the grammar only, p. 23. 3 'conuersa iam ipsa in spiritu'; 'in' denotes the sphere of application or the basis of the Name. But it is very awkward to say that the title of 'filius dei' belongs to the Man only 'in filio dei,' which must mean 'in virtue of His union with the Son of God': and N. can hardly have written the words as they stand. If we were to adopt Welchman's conjecture, the rendering would be simple, 'so that the secondary right to the Name is vested in the Son of Man.' (Note that 'filius dei,' l. 4, is treated as though indeclinable.)

4, 5. **principalitas ... sequella**] These or cognate words occur in legal language, of a first claim or duty and one postponed or secondary respectively. Thus Scaevola l. 46 tit. 3, leg. 93 *a med.* 'ubi ei obligationi, quae sequellae obtinet locum, principalis accedit, confusa est obligatio.' See Dirksen's *Manuale* s.v. 'principalis' § 2; he gives 'accessio' as the equivalent of 'sequella.' In the language of grammarians, 'principalis' and 'principalitas' describe 'original' or 'primary,' as distinct from 'derivative' forms.

6. **consequenter**] 'by consequence.' *Hic* refers to 'hominis.'

sit, dum non principaliter filius dei est. atque ideo dispositionem istam angelus uidens et ordinem istum sacramenti expediens, non sic cuncta confundens ut nullum uestigium distinctionis collocarit, distinctionem posuit, dicendo: *propterea et quod nascetur ex te sanctum, uocabitur filius dei:* ne si distributionem istam cum libramentis suis non dispensasset, sed in confuso permixtam reliquisset, vere occasionem haereticis contulisset, ut hominis filium, qua homo est, eundem et dei et hominis filium pronuntiare deberent. nunc autem particulatim exponens, tam magni sacramenti ordinem atque rationem euidenter expressit, ut diceret, *et quod ex te nascetur sanctum, uocabitur filius dei*, probans quoniam filius dei descendit: qui dum filium hominis in se suscepit, consequenter illum filium dei fecit; quoniam illum filius sibi dei sociauit et iunxit, ut dum filius hominis adhaeret in natiuitate filio dei, ipsa permixtione faeneratum et mutuatum teneret, quod ex natura propria possidere non posset. ac sic facta est angeli uoce, quod nolunt haeretici, inter filium dei hominisque, cum sua tamen sociatione, distinctio, urgendo illos uti Christum, hominis filium hominem, intellegant quoque dei filium, et hominem dei filium, id est dei uerbum (sicut scriptum est)

4 collocarit] -aret? 9 et hominis *unc. incl.* We. 15 natiuitatem γ Pa: -te *corr.* Ja. 21 id est dei uerbum *ex a suppl.* Pa: id est uerbum γ.

1. **dispositionem**] as p. 53. 7 'blasphemiam dispositione legitima congruenter refutauit.'

2. **sacramenti**] ch. xxiii, p. 86. 7.

3. **expediens**] 'developing,' 'explaining': cp. p. 110 l. 7 'regulam ueritatis expedit': *de Laud. Martyr.* iv 'tunc omne fidei robur expeditur': *de Spect.* vi 'cui ars sit uerba manibus expedire.'

5. **ne si distributionem...**] 'lest if he did not allot that partition of natures with its due balance and left it in hazy confusion, he might give the heretics a real excuse for' etc.

9. **deberent**] Cp. note on p. 85 l. 14.

16. **ipsa permixtione posset...**] 'He held on loan, by the very fact of the union, that which of His own nature He was not competent to possess.'

18. **cum sua tamen sociatione**] 'yet with the proper association of the Two.'

19. **urgendo**] a modal use of abl. gerund: *urgentis* would have given the same sense. A classical idiom: v. my note on Cic. *Cluent.* 167, referring to Verg. *A.* ii 81. 'Pressing them to understand that Christ, who is man, the Son of Man, is also the Son of God; and to accept as Man the Son of God, that is the Word of God who is (according to the Scriptures) God.'

deum, accipiant, atque ideo Christum Iesum dominum (ut ita dixerim) ex utroque contextum atque concretum, et in eadem utriusque substantiae concordia mutui ad inuicem foederis confibulatione sociatum, hominem et deum, scripturae hoc ipsum dicentis ueritate, cognoscant.

25 XXV. Ergo, inquiunt, si Christus non homo est tantum sed et deus, Christum autem refert scriptura mortuum pro nobis et resuscitatum, iam docet nos scriptura credere deum mortuum: aut si deus non moritur, Christus autem mortuus refertur, non erit Christus deus, quoniam deus non potest accipi mortuus. si umquam intellegerent aut intellexissent quod legunt, numquam tam periculose omnino loquerentur. sed erroris semper est abrupta dementia; et non est nouum si usque ad periculosa descendunt, qui fidem legitimam reliquerunt. si enim scriptura proponeret Christum tantummodo deum, et nulla in illo fragilitatis humanae sociatio esset permixta, merito illorum hic aliquid ualuisset sermo contortus, 'si Christus deus, Christus autem mortuus, ergo mortuus est deus.' sed cum non tantummodo illum, ut ostendimus iam

1 *post* dominum *edd. priores* ex utroque conexum : *om.* Ja.

2. **in eadem**] 'with either substance meeting in the clasp of a reciprocal bond, is God and Man in one.' Cp. p. 43. 8 'scripturam euangelicam utramque istam substantiam in unam natiuitatis Christi foederasse concordiam.'

XXV. *The heretics' objections further considered—That if Christ is not only man but God, and if He died and rose again, it follows that Scripture teaches that God died: so that Christ cannot be God. This rash objection would hold, if Scripture declared that Christ is God only, without admixture of weak humanity. But Scripture does not so declare; and that which is immortal in Him remained incorrupt. Deity is impassible, humanity passible. It was the Human in Him, not the Divine, which died. Even with other men, it is the flesh alone which dies. Immortality is the birthright of the human soul: much more then of the Word of God who cannot be put to death by human power or cruelty. For the soul was created through the Word of God. Thus the Word was not in His Godhead brought to mortality. Even in the case of the Patriarchs, the power of death availed only against the body.*

13. **abrupta**] prop. 'precipitous': hence 'desperate,' 'foolhardy.'

17. **merito illorum...contortus**] 'their perverse argument would have been in this case deserving of some consideration.' Cp. Cic. *Acad.* ii 75 'contorta et aculeata quaedam sophismata.'

frequenter, deum sed et hominem scriptura constituat, consequens est, quod immortale est, incorruptum mansisse teneatur. quis enim non intellegat, quod impassibilis sit diuinitas, passibilis uero sit humana fragilitas? cum ergo tam ex eo quod deus est, quam etiam ex illo quod homo est, Christus intellegatur esse permixtus et esse sociatus,—*uerbum* enim *caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis*—quis non sine ullo magistro atque interprete ex sese facile cognoscat, non illud in Christo mortuum esse quod deus est, sed illud in illo mortuum esse quod homo est? quid enim si diuinitas in Christo non moritur, sed carnis solius substantia exstinguitur, quando et in ceteris hominibus, qui non sunt caro tantummodo, sed caro et anima, caro quidem sola incursum interitus mortisque patiatur, extra leges autem interitus et mortis anima incorrupta cernatur? hoc enim et ipse dominus, hortans nos ad martyrium et ad contemptum omnis humanae potestatis, aiebat: *ne timueritis eos qui corpus occidunt, animam autem occidere non possunt.* quod si anima immortalis occidi aut interfici non potest in quouis alio, licet corpus et caro sola possit interfici, quanto magis utique uerbum dei deus in Christo interfici omnino non potuit, cum caro sola et corpus occisum sit? si enim hanc habet generositatem immortalitatis anima in quouis homine,

1 consequens est] *edd. Angli addunt* ut. 11 quando et in ceteris... *ex a suppl.* Pa.

1. 'It follows that what is immortal must be held to have remained uncorrupted.' On the fact that God is not only impassible but 'incompassible,' i.e. cannot be held to have suffered with the Son in His Human nature, cp. Tertullian *adu. Prax.* ch. xxix, who argues that if the mud is stirred up in a clear stream, the fountain-head does not suffer: 'fluuii iniuria non pertinet ad fontem.' It must be remembered that a formula of the Patripassians was 'pater compassus est filio': this, and not the Divine sympathy with men, is that which Tertullian and Novatian wish to controvert.

4. **quod deus est**] For this phrase expressing 'deity,' cp. n. on p. 14. 13.

16. **ne tim.**] Matt. x. 28.

22. **generositatem immortalitatis**] lit. 'noble quality,' i.e. 'birthright of immortality.' Cp. p. 28 l. 1 'praecipuus atque generosus prae omnibus dei filius,' and *de Cib. Iud.* iii 'bonum suum non in animi generositate sed in sola carne ponentem.' The argument is 'a fortiori': if the death of an ordinary man does not destroy the human soul, but only the body, much less did the Death of Christ, in whom a Divine and a Human nature are united, destroy the Word of God in Him. Thus 'God in Him does not die.' *v.* Introd. § 5 ii.

ut non possit interfici, multo magis hanc habet potestatem generositas uerbi dei, ut non possit occidi. nam si potestas hominum ad interficiendam sacram dei potestatem, et si crudelitas humana ad interficiendam animam deficit, multo magis ad dei uerbum interficiendum deficere debebit. nam cum ipsa anima, quae per dei uerbum facta est, ab hominibus non occiditur, multo magis utique uerbum dei perimi non posse credetur. et si plus non potest hominum cruenta saeuitia aduersus homines, quam ut tantummodo corpus occidat, quanto magis utique in Christo non ualebit, quam ut item tantummodo corpus occidat: ut, dum per haec colligitur non nisi hominem in Christo interfectum, appareat ad mortalitatem sermonem in loco non esse deductum. nam si Abraham, et Isaac, et Iacob, quos homines tantummodo constat fuisse, manifestum est uiuere—*omnes enim*, inquit, illi *uiuunt deo*, nec mors in illis animam perimit, quae corpora ipsa soluit; ius enim suum exercere potuit in corpora, in animas exercere non ualuit: aliud enim in illis mortale, et ideo mortuum, aliud in illis immortale, et ideo intellegitur non exstinctum, ob quam causam uiuere deo pronuntiati et dicti sunt,—multo magis utique mors in Christum aduersum solam materiam corporis potuit ualere, aduersus diuinitatem sermonis non potuit se exercere. frangitur enim potestas mortis, ubi intercedit auctoritas immortalitatis.

11 idem *edd.*: eadem G: item *nos corr.* 13 in loco γ Pa *ceteri*: in illo *coni.* Latin.: inlico (*sc.* ilico) Ja.

3. **sacram dei potestatem**] sc. 'ut non possit interfici' (line 1), a power inherent in the soul and given by God: *dei* being a 'subjective' genitive.

13. **in loco**] This appears to be an adverbial phrase with the sense 'therein' or 'in consequence': for which some support may be found in such a use of *ilico* as we find in Cic. *De Fato* § 28 'nec si omne enuntiatum aut uerum aut falsum est, sequitur ilico esse causas immutabilis quae' etc.

15. Luke xx 38. It is worth while to observe how N.'s addition of 'illi' narrows the scope of the saying.

XXVI. *Heretical objections from the other side—'If there is One God and Christ is God, Christ being One God with the Father* is *the Father.' But they are using names without intelligence. The Son is the Second Person of the Trinity next to the Father: as may be shewn from many passages of O.T. and N.T., especially of St John. The Lord Himself speaks*

XXVI. Sed ex hac occasione, quia Christus non homo 26 tantum sed et deus diuinarum litterarum sacris auctoritatibus approbatur, alii haeretici erumpentes statum in Christo religionis concutere machinantur, hoc ipso patrem deum uolentes ostendere Christum esse, dum non homo tantum asseritur, sed et deus promitur. sic enim inquiunt: si unus esse deus promitur, Christus autem deus, ergo, inquiunt, si pater et Christus est unus deus, Christus pater dicetur. in quo errare probantur, Christum non noscentes, sed sonum nominis approbantes. nolunt enim illum secundam esse personam post patrem, sed ipsum patrem. quibus quia facile respondetur, pauca dicentur. quis enim non secundam filii post patrem agnoscat esse personam, cum legat dictum a patre consequenter ad filium: *faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram;* et post haec relatum, *et fecit deus hominem, ad imaginem dei fecit illum*? aut cum inter manus teneat: *pluit dominus super Sodomam et Gomorrham ignem et sulpur a domino de caelo*? aut cum ad Christum: *filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te; postula a me et dabo tibi gentes hereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terrae*? aut cum etiam ille desideratus scriba ait: *dixit dominus domino*

17 dominus α: deus *al.* 18 filius meus es tu *ex* α *suppl.* Pa. 21 desideratus scriba *om.* γ: aut cum etiam ille desideratus...domino meo Pa *ex* α.

of the revelation of this Mystery: and defines it as the Rule of faith. I might multiply Scripture proofs that He is born of the Father, ever obedient to Him; ever holding power over all things, yet in so far as it has been delivered unto Him by the Father. The fact of this obedience forbids us to suppose that Christ is *the Father.*

1. 'Other heretics [sc. the Patripassians] break out with a design to unsettle the basis of religion in Christ: they desire to shew that Christ is God the Father, by this very fact that He is not only asserted to be Man but declared to be God.'

14. **consequenter**] 'conformably' to such a view, in Gen. i 26, 27. In *v.* 27 Vulg. has *creauit*, as of something 'for the first time called into being,' following the Hebrew. LXX has the verb ποιεῖν throughout *vv.* 26, 27.

16. Gen. xix 24: cp. *De Trin.* xviii p. 66. 5.

18. Ps. ii 7, 8: cp. *De Trin.* ix p. 30. 15. **ad Christum**, sc. 'legat dictum.'

21. **ille desideratus scriba**] referring to the etymology of the name David, which means 'beloved,' 'desired.' Ps. cix (cx) 1.

meo: sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum? aut cum Isaiae prophetias explicans inuenit positum sic: *haec dicit dominus Christo meo domino?* aut cum legit: *non descendi de caelo ut faciam uoluntatem meam, sed uoluntatem eius qui misit me?* aut dum inuenit positum: *quoniam qui me misit, maior me est?* aut cum considerat scriptum: *eo ad patrem meum et patrem uestrum, deum meum et deum uestrum?* aut quando habet cum ceteris collocatum: *sed in lege uestra scriptum est, quia duorum testimonium uerum est; ego de me testificor, et testificatus est de me qui me misit pater?* aut quando uox de caelo redditur: *et honorificaui, et honorificabo?* aut quando a Petro respondetur et dicitur: *tu es filius dei uiui?* aut quando ab ipso domino sacramentum huius reuelationis approbatur, et dicitur: *beatus es, Simon Bariona: quoniam hoc tibi non reuelauit caro et sanguis, sed pater meus qui in caelis est?* aut quando ab ipso Christo exprimitur: *pater, clarifica me eo honore, quo fui apud te, antequam mundus fieret?* aut cum ab eodem dicitur: *pater, sciebam quia semper me audis; uerum propter circumstantes dixi, ut credant quia tu me misisti?* aut cum definitio regulae ab ipso Christo collocatur, et dicitur: *haec est autem*

3 haec dicit dominus *om.* γ: inuenit positum...meo domino Pa *ex* a.
8 collocutum *edd. prior.*, *corr.* We.

2. **explicans**] 'opening,' lit. 'unrolling.' *Inuenit*, the subject is the same as that of *quis non agnoscat* supra.

3. **haec dicit dominus Christo meo domino**] Is. xlv 1, where Vulg. has 'Cyro' with the Hebr. The quotation is based on Κυρίῳ, an ancient corruption of Κύρῳ which the best text of LXX reads: the same error appears in Tertull. *adu. Iudaeos* vii, *adu. Prax.* xi and xxviii.

4. Jo. vi 38.

6. Jo. xiv 28.

7. Jo. xx 17 Vulg. 'ascendo ad Patrem meum.'

8. **collocatum**] a favourite word of the writer: here 'stated': in pp. 30. 18, 67. 4 'represent': in *De Cib. Iud.* ii 'in primis illud collocandum est *legem spiritalem esse.*'

9. Jo. viii 17, 18 Vulg. 'ego sum, qui testimonium perhibeo de meipso; et testimonium perhibet de me, qui misit me, Pater.'

11. Jo. xii 28 Vulg. 'et clarificaui et iterum clarificabo': there are other variations in the quotations of this chapter.

13. Matt. xvi 16, 17.

17. Jo. xvii 5: cp. *De Trin.* xiii p. 43. 15, xvii p. 57. 1.

19. Jo. xi 42.

20. **definitio regulae**] cf. n. on 'regula ueritatis' ch. i.

21. Jo. xvii 3, 4: cp. *De Trin.* xvi p. 56, 6.

uita aeterna, ut sciant te unum et uerum deum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum. ego te honorificaui super terram, opus perfeci quod dedisti mihi? aut cum item ab eodem asseritur et dicitur: *omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre meo?* aut cum *sedere ad dexteram* patris et a prophetis et ab apostolis approbatur? et satis longum facio, si enisus fuero omnes omnino ad hanc partem uoces congregare; quandoquidem tam ueteris quam etiam noui testamenti scriptura diuina ubique ostendat illum ex patre natum, per quem facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil, qui oboedierit semper patri et oboediat, semper habentem rerum omnium potestatem, sed qua traditam, sed qua concessam, sed qua a patre proprio sibi indultam. quid enim tam euidens potest esse, hunc non patrem esse, sed filium, quam quod oboediens patri deo proponitur, ne si pater esse credatur, alteri iam deo patri Christus subiectus esse dicatur?

XXVII. Sed quia frequenter intendunt illum nobis locum 27

8 non *tam ueteris* edd. priores.

4. Luke x 22.

5. The ref. is probably to Ps. cix (cx) 1 (for which cp. *supra* ix p. 30. 15) and Mk xvi 19. Edd. refer to Hebr. i 3, but it is a question whether Novatian himself recognised the canonicity of the Ep. to the Hebrews, from which he does not quote, though it might have given him many references. On this point, cp. c. xxxi, p. 123. 7.

6. **et satis longum facio** sqq.] 'and I should be engaging in quite an endless task, were I to set myself to collect together all utterances whatsoever which bear on this question.'

10. **oboedierit semper...et oboediat**] thus p. 38. 15 'oboediens patri qua filius': p. 81. 15 'omnem patri in omnibus rebus oboedientiam praestitit pariter ac praestat.'

13. **euidens**] active here, 'conclusive'—'Lest if Christ be believed to be the Father, it should be said that He is subjected to another God the Father.' *Iam* implies 'it comes to this, that there would be a second Father.'

XXVII. *The Patripassians lay special stress on the text* 'Ego et Pater unum sumus.' *But (a) the Persons of the Son and the Father are distinguished by the* et: *(b) the neuter gender* unum *denotes a concordant fellowship not a personal identity: (c) the plural* sumus *implies distinction of Persons; though They are one in concord and love. St Paul similarly uses* unum *to express concord, with distinction of persons and offices, when he says of himself and Apollos 'he that planteth and he that watereth are* one [unum].' *So generally. Men may be one in religion yet two in personality: the same, yet not identical. And in the sequel in St John, our Lord explains*

quo dictum sit: *ego et pater unum sumus*, et in hoc illos aeque facile uincemus. si enim erat, ut haeretici putant, pater Christus, oportuit dicere: *ego pater unus sum.* at cum *ego* dicit, deinde patrem infert, dicendo *ego et pater*, proprietatem personae suae, id est filii, a paterna auctoritate discernit atque distinguit, non tantummodo de sono nominis, sed etiam de ordine dispositae potestatis; qui potuisset dicere, *ego pater*, si patrem se esse meminisset. et quia dixit *unum*, intellegant haeretici quia non dixit *unus. unum* enim neutraliter positum societatis concordiam non unitatem personae sonat. *unum* enim non *unus* esse dicitur, quoniam nec ad numerum refertur, sed ad societatem alterius expromitur. denique adicit dicens, *sumus*, non *sum*, ut ostenderet per hoc quod dixit, *sumus ego et pater*, duas esse personas; *unum* autem quod ait, ad concordiam et eandem sententiam et ad ipsam caritatis societatem pertinere, ut merito unum sit pater et filius per concordiam et per amorem et per dilectionem. et

3 ego et pater unus γ Pa: *om.* et G *et* Ja: unum G. 14 ego *ins.* Ja. 16 pertinere γ: -et Latin. Pa, -eret *al.*

to the Jews in what sense He calls Himself God: viz. as the Son of God sanctified and sent by the Father. As receiving sanctification, He is inferior to the Father. As sent, He is proved to be the Son, not the Father who is the Sender; for there cannot be two Fathers. And the controversy is settled by His own declaration that He is the Son of God.

3. **dicere ego et pater unus sum]** Jackson says that Gangneius and de la Barre read *Ego Pater unum sum.* Migne reports them as reading *ego et Pater unum sum*: but this is possibly one of his misprints. Jo. x 30.

4. **proprietatem]** 'peculiarity,' 'distinctive character.'

6. **non t. de sono n.]** 'Not only by the mere sound of the name [Son] but by the order in economy of power': that is to say κατ' οἰκονομίαν. For 'dispositae' cp. n. on c. xv p. 53. 7.

11—14. 'Let the heretics understand that He did not say One (in the masculine); because One in the neuter gender signifies a fellowship of common feeling, not a unity of person'...'Since its reference is not numerical, but it is a declaration of fellowship with another.' A similar argument is used by Tertull. *adu. Prax.* xxii, Hippol. *c. Noet.* 7 and many later writers.

12. **expromitur]** Cp. the use of 'promitur' in last ch. p. 94 l. 7: hence Welchman's suggestion *exprimitur* is unnecessary.

ib. **denique]** 'And in fact,' a post-classical usage.

14. **unum quod ait...per dilectionem]** This interpretation, though true as far as it goes, is quite inadequate from the later Catholic point of view, nor does the illustration (which follows) from 1 Cor. iii 8 improve matters. The 'unity of essence' is something much more

quoniam ex patre est, quicquid illud est, filius est, manente tamen distinctione, ut non sit pater ille qui filius, quia nec filius ille qui pater est. nec enim *sumus* addidisset, si unum se et solitarium patrem filium factum esse meminisset.

Denique nouit hanc concordiae unitatem et apostolus Paulus, cum personarum tamen distinctione. nam cum ad Corinthios scriberet, *ego*, inquit, *plantaui*, *Apollo rigauit*, *sed deus incrementum dedit. itaque neque qui plantat est quicquam*, *neque qui rigat*, *sed qui incrementum dat deus. qui autem plantat*, *et qui rigat*, *unum sunt.* quis autem non intellegat alterum esse Apollo, alterum Paulum, non eundem atque ipsum Apollo pariter et Paulum? denique et diuersa uniuscuiusque sunt officia prolata: alter enim *qui plantat*, et alter *qui rigat.* hos tamen duos, non quod *unus* sit, sed quod *unum* sint, proposuit apostolus Paulus, ut alter quidem sit Apollo, alter uero Paulus, quantum ad personarum distinctionem pertinet; [quantum uero ad concordiam pertinet], *unum* ambo sint. nam quando duorum una sententia est, ueritas una est, fides una est, una atque eadem religio est, unus etiam dei timor est, unum sunt, etiam si duo sint. ipsum sunt, dum ipsum sapiunt. etenim quos personae ratio inuicem diuidit, eosdem rursus inuicem religionis ratio conducit. et quamuis idem atque ipsi non sint, dum idem sentiunt, ipsum sunt; et cum duo sint, unum

16 quantum uero ad c. pertinet *ins.* Ja. 23 ipsum Pa *ex* α: ipsi *al.*

than 'societatis concordia.' Refer to Introd. § 5 i, pp. xlvii, xlviii.

1. **quicquid illud est**] The neuter gives the effect of something which cannot entirely be defined, and need not (with Welchm.) be altered to *ille*. Cp. iv p. 15. 7 'quicquid esse potest quod deus est,' v p. 18. 7, vi p. 21. 17 'quicquid illud est totus.'

7. **ego...plantaui**] 1 Cor. iii 6.

11. **non eundem** sq.] 'the selfsame person is not equally Paul and Apollos.' Cp. note on xxiv, p. 86. 14.

14. The 'quod' construction is preferred to the more normal infinitive construction 'esse,' in order to bring out the contrast of 'unus' with 'unum,' which the latter would have forfeited.

16. **[quantum uero ad concordiam pertinet]** Jackson, following Latinius, inserts these words. Evidently the homoeoteleuton caused the omission of the clause.

20. **ipsum sunt, dum ipsum sapiunt**] 'they are the same thing, being of the same mind': post-classical use of *ipse*. 'Sapiunt'= φρονοῦσιν.

21. 'For those whom personality divides, religion brings together again.'

sunt, habentes in fide societatem, etiam si gerant in personis diuersitatem.

Denique cum ad has uoces domini imperitia fuisset Iudaica commota et temere ad usque saxa succensa, ita ut discurrerent et dicerent: *non te lapidamus propter bonum opus, sed propter blasphemiam, et quia tu, cum homo sis, facis te deum*, distinctionem posuit dominus in ratione reddenda, quomodo se deum aut dixisset aut intellegi uellet. *quem pater sanctificauit*, inquit, *et misit in hunc mundum, uos dicitis, quia blasphemas, quia dixi, filius dei sum?* etiam hic patrem habere se dixit. filius est ergo, non pater—patrem enim confessus se fuisset, si patrem se esse meminisset—et sanctificatum se a suo patre esse proponit. dum ergo accipit sanctificationem a patre, minor patre est: minor autem patre consequenter [non pater] est, sed filius. pater enim si fuisset, sanctificationem dedisset, non accepisset. nunc autem profitendo se accepisse sanctificationem a patre, hoc ipso, quo patre se minorem accipiendo ab ipso sanctificationem probat, filium se esse, non patrem monstrauit. missum praeterea se esse dicit, ut per hanc oboedientiam, qua uenit dominus Christus missus, non pater sed filius probetur, qui misisset utique, si pater fuisset. missus autem non fuit pater, ne pater subditus alteri deo, dum mittitur, probaretur. et tamen post haec adicit, quod omnem omnino ambiguitatem dissolueret et totam controuersiam erroris exstingueret. ait enim in ultima parte sermonis: *uos dicitis, quia blasphemas, quia dixi, filius dei sum?* ergo si euidenter filium dominus se, non patrem, esse testatur, magnae temeritatis et ingentis est furoris exemplum contra ipsius Christi domini testimonium controuersiam diuinitatis et religionis agitare, et

14 non pater *ins.* We. 16 *uerba* et nunc autem...filium se esse *ex a suppl.* Pa, *sed delendum* et: hoc ipso quo...probat *om.* γ. 17 quo: ?quod.

5. Jo. x 33.

6. 'The Lord laid down a distinction, while stating the principle upon which He had said that He was God or wished this to be understood.'

8. **quem pater sanctificauit**] loosely governed (as in the Greek) by *dicitis*: 'say ye of Him, Thou blasphemest?' Jo. x 36.

29. 'To set agoing a controversy about the Divine nature and about

Christum Iesum patrem esse dicere, cum animaduertat illum non patrem se, sed filium, comprobasse.

XXVIII. Adhuc adiciam illam quoque partem in qua 28
dum haereticus quasi oculo quodam gaudet proprio, ueritatis et luminis amisso, totam caecitatem sui agnoscat erroris. identidem enim et frequenter opponit quia dictum sit: *tanto tempore uobiscum sum, et non agnoscitis me? Philippe, qui uidit me, uidit et patrem.* sed quod non intellegit, discat. culpatur Philippus, et iure quidem meritoque, quia dixerit: *domine, ostende nobis patrem, et sufficit nobis.* quando enim ex Christo aut audierat istud aut didicerat, quasi esset pater Christus, cum contra magis, quod filius esset, non quia pater, frequenter audisset, et saepe didicisset? quod enim dixit dominus, *si me cognouistis, et patrem meum cognouistis, et*

4 propriae γ Pa: *corr.* Ja.

religion.' The subject of *animaduertat* is the disputant.

XXVIII. *A second argument of the heretics is based on the words 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' Philip is rightly blamed for having failed to learn the truth taught by Christ, viz., not that He is the Father, but that to know Christ is tantamount to knowing the Father, to whom we are to come through Christ. For Holy Scripture often speaks in the 'prophetic present.' What shall be is spoken of as what already is. In this sense he who sees the Son has seen the Invisible Father whose works He imitates. If the Father is Christ, how are we to account for many other passages in St John which distinguish the Son from the Father who sent Him? To believe in the Son is to contemplate the Image of God, through which we rise to the contemplation of the Father. Then there is the promise to the 'pure in heart,' implying that the vision of God has not yet been granted. Those two passages are the very eyes of that body of heretical doctrine: without them, it is blindness.*

3. 'I will further proceed to the point upon which the heretic rejoices (so to speak) in an eye of his own, though he has lost that of truth and light, and in so doing must acknowledge the full blindness of his error.' There is a play upon the words *uidit me*. With *amisso* understand *oculo*. The metaphor is resumed in the last three lines of the chapter. For *partem* in this sense cp. p. 96 l. 6 'omnes ad hanc partem uoces congregare.'

7. Jo. xiv 9 Vulg. *cognouistis ...uidet...uidet.*

9. Jo. xiv 8. The argument is: Philip is rightly blamed for his question, not because Christ whom he had seen is the Father, but because coming to Christ is, by a sort of anticipation, coming to the Father.

14. **cognouistis**] Jo. xiv 7. The Vulg. has *-issetis* in both cases, which one might be tempted to adopt, but that Tertull. *adu. Prax.* xxiv has 'cognouistis,'—as also *uidet* in the previous quotation.

a modo nostis illum, et uidistis illum, non sic dixerat ut se patrem uellet intellegi, sed quoniam qui penitus et plene et cum tota fide et tota religione accessit ad dei filium, omnibus modis per ipsum filium, in quem sic credit, ad patrem peruenturus sit, eundemque uisurus. *nemo enim,* inquit, *potest uenire ad patrem nisi per me.* et ideo ad patrem deum non tantum uenturus est, et cogniturus ipsum patrem, sed etiam sic tenere debet, atque ita animo ac mente praesumere, quasi iam nouerit patrem pariter et uiderit.

Saepe enim scriptura diuina, quae nondum facta pro factis annuntiat, quia sic futura sunt, et quae omnibus modis fieri habent, non quasi futura sint, praedicat, sed quasi facta sint, narrat. denique cum nondum temporibus Isaiae prophetae Christus natus fuisset, *quia puer,* aiebat, *natus est nobis;* et cum nondum accessum esset ad Mariam, *et accessi ad prophetissam,* dicebat, *et concepit, et peperit filium.* et cum nondum sinum patris Christus exposuisset, referebat: *et uocatur nomen eius magni consilii angelus.* et cum nondum fuisset passus, *quasi*

17 uocabitur *corr.* Ja.

1. **a modo**] 'henceforth.' From Tertull. *adu. Prax.* xxvi it is plain that the Patripassians based their opinion largely on this answer to St Philip, forgetting, as he says, that 'so many plain pronouncements, antecedent and following, could not be overturned by one text (*sermo*), interpreted not only in the face of them, but of its own plain meaning.' Cp. n. on xxi, p. 76 l. 1.

3. **omnibus modis**] 'wholly,' 'certainly,' as in l. 11 below: an early Latin idiom revived, like *miris modis* of Lucr. i 123.

5. Jo. xiv 6.

8. **praesumere**] here simply 'to anticipate.' Generally it means 'to take for granted,' with an implication of hasty or self-willed assumption; thus in Tertull. *de Testim. Animae* iv 'cuius (resurrectionis) nos praesumptores denotamur': and c. xxx, p. 114. 20 'humani erroris praesumptione, qua haeretici esse uoluerunt.'

11. **fieri habent**] 'are about to happen.' For this analytic future cp. Tertull. *l.c.* 'eum qui nasci habebat a uirgine, ab ipso annuntiari angelo.' Cp. c. xviii, p. 64. 4.

13. **denique**] 'Accordingly'; cp. xxvii, p. 97. 12.

14. Is. ix 6.

15. Is. viii 3.

16. **sinum patris exposuisset**] cp. xviii p. 68. 4, note.

17. **uocatur**] as LXX καλεῖται (Is. ix 6): the old editions give 'uocabitur' (as in Vulg.). The sense demands the present, '*praesens futurascens,*' according to the writer's argument. Similarly below, Is. liii 7, *iugulationem* is a nearer equivalent of LXX σφαγήν, than Vulg. 'occisionem.'

ouis, pronuntiabat, *ad iugulationem adductus est.* et cum adhuc crux nusquam esset, aiebat: *tota die expandi manus meas ad populum non credentem.* et cum nondum iniuriose potatus fuisset, *in siti*, ait, *mea potauerunt me aceto.* et cum spoliatus adhuc non fuisset, dicebat, *super uestem meam miserunt sortem: et dinumerauerunt ossa mea: effoderunt manus meas et pedes.* prouidens enim scriptura diuina pro factis dicit, quae futura scit, et pro perfectis dicit, quae futura habet, quae sine dubitatione uentura sunt. et ideo dominus in praesenti loco dicebat: *a modo nostis illum, et uidistis.* dicebat enim uisum iri ab eo patrem, quisquis filium secutus fuisset; non quasi filius ipse esset pater uisus, sed quod praemium consecuturus esset, quisquis illum sequi et discipulus eius esse uoluisset, ut uidere patrem posset. nam et imago est dei patris, ut his etiam illud accedat, quoniam sicut pater operatur, ita operatur et filius, et imitator est filius omnium operum paternorum; ut perinde habeat unusquisque, quasi iam uiderit patrem, dum eum uidet qui inuisibilem patrem in omnibus operibus semper imitatur.

Ceterum si ipse pater est Christus, quomodo confestim adicit et dicit: *qui credit in me, opera quae ego facio et ipse faciet, et maiora his faciet, quia ego ad patrem uado?* et adhuc subnectit: *si diligitis me, praecepta mea seruate: et ego rogabo patrem, et alium aduocatum dabit uobis.* post quae etiam illud subnectit: *si quis me diligit, sermonem meum custodiet: et pater*

2. Is. lxv 2.

3. **iniuriose potatus fuisset**] 'had been offered the cup of scorn.' For *potare* in this sense, see Rönsch *It. u. V.* p. 376.

4. Ps. lxviii 22 (lxix 21).

5. Ps. xxi 19, 18, 17 (xxii 18, 17, 16).

14. **ut his etiam illud...**] 'so that there is this further truth, that etc.' N. is giving the substance of Jo. v 17 and 19. Besides the future reward of seeing the Father, there is the fact that even now we see the Father at work in the acts of Christ. That is the meaning of the '*et imago*.'

16. **et imitator est** cet.] So c. xxii, p. 81. 2.

ib. **ut perinde habeat...inuisibilem**] 'so that a man may feel just as if he has seen the Father already in seeing Him' etc.

19, 21. Jo. xiv 12, 15, 16. As the 'confestim' shews, the preceding paragraph ('saepe enim scriptura' to 'semper imitatur') is parenthetical: 'ceterum' resumes the main argument.

23. **aduocatum**] Vulg. 'Paracletum.'

24. Jo. xiv 23, 26.

meus diliget illum, et ad eum ueniemus, et mansionem apud illum faciemus. nec non etiam subdidit illud quoque: *aduocatus autem ille spiritus sanctus, quem missurus est pater, ille uos docebit et commemorabit omnia quaecumque dixero.* praemittit adhuc istum locum, quo ostendat se esse filium, et merito subdidit, et dicit: *si me diligeretis, gauderetis, quia eo ad patrem: quia pater maior me est.* quid autem cum etiam illa subnectit: *ego sum uitis uera, et pater meus agricola: omne sarmentum in me non afferens fructum tollit illud, et omne fructiferum purgat, ut fructum ampliorem ferat?* instat adhuc et adicit: *sicut dilexit me pater, et ego dilexi uos: manete in mea caritate; si mandata mea seruaueritis, manebitis in mea caritate, sicut ego patris mandata seruaui, et maneo in eius caritate.* adhuc ingerit, et dicit: *dixi autem uos amicos, quia omnia quae audiui a patre meo, nota uobis feci.* aggregat etiam hoc: *sed haec omnia facient uobis propter nomen meum, quia ignorant eum qui me misit.*

Haec ergo numquam post illa euidenter illum non patrem sed filium esse testantia dominus subdidisset, si aut patrem se esse meminisset, aut patrem se uellet intellegi. nisi quoniam ut illud exprimeret, perinde unumquemque iam habere debere, dum imaginem dei patris per filium uidet, atque si uiderit patrem—quandoquidem unusquisque credens in filium exerceatur in imaginis contemplatione, ut assuefactus ad diuinitatem uidendam imagine proficere possit et crescere usque ad

11 *uerba* manete in mea...eius caritate Pa *ex* α. 25 proficere p. et crescere Pa *ex* α.

6. *ib.* 28.

8. Jo. xv 1, 2, where Vulg. has 'omnem palmitem...non ferentem fructum, tollet eum; et omnem qui fert fructum, purgabit eum, ut fructum plus afferat.'

11. Jo. xv 9, 10 Vulg. 'in dilectione mea...praecepta.'

11, 14, 15. **adicit...ingerit...aggregat**] The evidence is cumulative or progressive.

14, 16. Jo. xv 15, 21.

20. **nisi quoniam** sq.] 'His only purpose was to express that every man should henceforth account it the same thing to see the image of God the Father through the Son, as to have seen the Father.'

25. **imagine**] adverbially 'by' or 'in the image.' The influence of Platonic teaching is unmistakeable in such passages: e.g. *Repub.* 516 A ξυνηθείας δὴ δέοιτ' ἄν, εἰ μέλλοι τὰ ἄνω ὄψεσθαι, the prisoner

dei patris omnipotentis perfectam contemplationem,—et quoniam, qui hoc animo ac mente combiberit et de omnibus sic futurum esse crediderit, patrem, quem uisurus sit, quasi iam quodammodo uiderit et hic iam sic habeat, quasi teneat, quod habiturum se pro certo sciat.

Ceterum, si ipse pater fuisset, quid quasi futurum praemium repromittebat, quod iam praestiterat et dederat? nam quoniam dicit: *beati mundo corde, quia ipsi deum uidebunt*, polliceri deprehenditur contemplationem et aspectum patris. ergo nondum dederat: cur enim repromitteret, si iam dedisset? dederat enim, si pater esset; uidebatur enim, et contingebatur. quando autem, dum contingitur ipse Christus et uidetur, repromittit tamen et dicit, quoniam qui mundo fuerit corde, deum uidebit, hoc ipso probat patrem se non esse, qui tunc praesens cum uideretur repromittebat, quod patrem uisurus esset quisquis mundo corde fuisset. erat ergo repromittens haec non pater sed filius; quia qui filius erat, quod uideri habebat repromittebat: cuius repromissio superuacua fuisset, nisi filius fuisset. cur enim repromittebat mundis ut uiderent patrem,

in the cave of shadows 'will require to grow accustomed before he can attain to the sight of the upper world,' and the whole context. In Plato the ascent through 'images' to the Idea of Good is an ascent from that which is in process and shadow to that which *is*: *μάθημα ψυχῆς ὁλκὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ γιγνομένου ἐπὶ τὸ ὄν* (*ib.* 521 D). Cp. R. L. Nettleship, *Philosoph. Remains*, pp. 366, 367. But we must not imagine that Catholic writers, speaking of Christ as the Image of the Father (cp. Hebr. i 3, Philipp. ii 6, Col. ii 9), implied a lower degree of reality in Him. Novatian's view may be further studied in c. xviii *init.*

1. **et quoniam, qui hoc...**] 'The truth is, also, that the man who has taken this deep into his heart and soul, and has entirely believed that thus it will be, has already seen, in a manner, the Father whom he is to see hereafter, and here already has, as if it were in his grasp, that which he knows for certain that he will one day have.' The difficulty of this passage is due to the fact that both 'quasi' and 'sic' occur respectively twice and in different usages: the former 'quasi' merely qualifies 'quodammodo,' the former 'sic' refers to the same truth as 'hoc.' The main assertion is contained in 'uiderit...et...habeat.' 'Hic' means 'here upon earth.' *Et quoniam* carries on the *nisi quoniam*, which expresses the actual state of things (cp. p. 40. 23 n.). 'De omnibus,' an adverbial phrase (cp. p. 3. 2 note) to be compared with 'omnibus modis' p. 101 l. 3.

8. Matt. v 8.

17. **quod uideri habebat**] 'what should afterwards be seen': cp. *fieri habent* supra p. 101. 11.

si iam tunc qui praesentes erant, patrem Christum uidebant? sed quia filius erat, non pater, merito et filius, quia imago dei, tunc uidebatur, et pater, quia inuisibilis, mundis corde, ut uideretur, repromittitur et notatur.

Haec igitur satis sit etiam aduersus istum haereticum dictasse, pauca de multis. campus enim, et quidem latus ac fusus, aperietur, plenius haereticum istum si agitare uoluerimus; quandoquidem duobus istis locis quibusdam effossis luminibus orbatus, totus sit in doctrinae suae caecitate superatus.

29 XXIX. Sed enim ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis uocibus et litteris domini admonet nos post haec credere etiam in spiritum sanctum, olim ecclesiae repromissum, sed

4. **notatur**] 'is notified' or 'set down' in scripture. Cp. Novatian's letter (*Ep. Cypr.* xxx 5) 'cum tam grande crimen per multos diffusum notatur exisse.'

7. **agitare**] 'to hunt' carries on the hunting metaphor in *campus*: as Hor. *C.* ii 13. 40 'aut timidos agitare lyncas.'

8. 'Since now that he has been deprived of those two passages [sc. Jo. x 30, xiv 9], it is like the loss of his two eyes, and he is left utterly defeated in the blindness of his doctrine.' Cp. the first lines of the chapter.

THE RULE OF TRUTH. *Third Part, dealing with the belief in* God *the* Holy Ghost.

XXIX. *The promise of the Holy Spirit given through the Prophets to the Church was fulfilled through Christ. He is called the Paraclete or the Spirit of truth. In the Prophets He reproved God's people, in the Apostles He exercised His advocacy on behalf of the Gentiles. In Him is a diversity of offices, according to the times and seasons: but He is One and the Same. In the Prophets He wrought for a moment and in measure, in the Apostolic Church He works for ever and in fulness. Christ gave at His departure the promise of the Paraclete. His operations in the Church are charismatic: they are gifts of the Spirit to the Church, the Bride of Christ. He came upon the Lord in plenitude, that He might be the Fountain-head of spiritual life, in fulfilment of prophecy. The Holy Spirit effects the new birth in Baptism, and makes us the temple of God, and sanctifies our bodies and associates them with His immortality. The Spirit conquers the flesh. The Spirit develops the Rule of Truth, banishes strange doctrines, guards the Gospels, and witnesses to the truth of Christ against heresy and its sacrilegious ordinances. He maintains the Church in her integrity and purity.*

10. **digestis uocibus et litteris domini**] 'by the words and Scriptures of the Lord set forth in due order,' i.e. 'in an orderly statement of the teaching of the Lord by His Word spoken and written.' Interesting as an early definition of the purpose of a Creed.

12. **olim eccl. repromissum**] So in Tertullian's Creed (*adu. Praxeam* 2) 'Qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum.'

statutis temporum opportunitatibus redditum. est enim per Ioelem prophetam repromissus, sed per Christum redditus. *in nouissimis*, inquit, *diebus effundam de spiritu meo super seruos et ancillas meas.* dominus autem: *accipite spiritum sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, erunt remissa; et quorum retinueritis, erunt retenta.* hunc autem spiritum sanctum dominus Christus modo *paraclitum* appellat, modo *spiritum ueritatis* esse pronuntiat. qui non est in euangelio nouus, sed nec noue datus. nam hic ipse et in prophetis populum accusauit, et in apostolis aduocationem gentibus praestitit. nam illi ut accusarentur merebantur, quia contempserant legem: et qui ex gentibus credunt, ut patrocinio spiritus adiuuentur merentur, quia ad euangelicam peruenire gestiunt legem. differentia sane in illo genera officiorum, quoniam in temporibus differens ratio causarum: nec ex hoc tamen ipse diuersus, qui haec sic gerit, nec alter est, dum sic agit, sed unus atque ipse est, diuidens officia sua per tempora et rerum occasiones atque momenta. denique apostolus Paulus: *habentes*, inquit, *eundem spiritum, sicut scriptum est: credidi, propter quod locutus sum, et nos credimus, ideo loquimur.* unus ergo et idem spiritus, qui in prophetis et apostolis; nisi quoniam ibi ad momentum, hic semper. ceterum ibi, non ut semper in

4 seruos *fort. addendum* meos. 15 diuersus *a*: diuiditur *γ al.*

1. **redditum**] 'duly bestowed': the word properly denotes the payment of a debt or due.

3. Joel ii 29.

4. Jo. xx 22, 23 Vulg. *remittuntur eis...retenta sunt.*

7. Jo. xiv 16, 17.

8. **sed nec noue datus**] 'nor is there anything new even in the mode of His bestowal.' The 'differences' mentioned below are a matter of degree and not of kind.

9. **populum accusauit**] This seems a curiously limited view of the work of the Spirit in the prophets; and indeed N. dwells elsewhere on the perversity of the Jews, almost to excess (cp. *de Trin.* pp. 71. 5–8, 23. 17, 48. 18: *de Cib. Iud.* i *ad fin.*: also the treatise *adu. Iudaeos*). But his special purpose here was to bring out, as against the Marcionites, the unity and consistency of the Spirit's action under the two covenants. Under the old, He had threatened to forsake the Jews: under the new, He fulfilled the threat.

14. **in illo**] 'in Him.' *Quoniam in temporibus* etc. 'since with difference of times occasions differ.' The language appears to be suggested by 1 Cor. xii 4.

18. **habentes** cet.] 2 Cor. iv 13.

21. **ibi**] sc. 'in Prophetis': *hic*, 'in Apostolis.'

illis inesset, hic, ut in illis semper maneret: et ibi mediocriter distributus, hic totus effusus; ibi parce datus, hic large commodatus; nec tamen ante resurrectionem domini exhibitus, sed per resurrectionem Christi contributus. *rogabo* enim aiebat, *patrem, et alium aduocatum dabit uobis, ut uobiscum sit in aeternum, spiritum ueritatis.* et: *cum uenerit aduocatus ille, quem ego missurus sum uobis a patre meo, spiritum ueritatis, qui de patre meo procedit.* et: *si non abiero ego, aduocatus ille non ueniet ad uos: si autem ego abiero, remittam illum ad uos.* et: *cum uenerit spiritus ueritatis, ille uos diriget in omnem ueritatem.* et quoniam dominus in caelos esset abiturus, paraclitum discipulis necessario dabat, ne illos quodammodo pupillos, quod minime decebat, relinqueret, et sine aduocato et quodam tutore desereret.

Hic est enim qui ipsorum animos mentesque firmauit, qui euangelica sacramenta distinxit, qui in ipsis illuminator rerum diuinarum fuit, quo confirmati pro nomine domini nec carceres nec uincula timuerunt; quin immo ipsas saeculi potestates et tormenta calcauerunt, armati iam scilicet per ipsum atque firmati, habentes in se dona, quae hic idem spiritus ecclesiae Christi sponsae quasi quaedam ornamenta distribuit et dirigit. hic est enim qui prophetas in ecclesia constituit, magistros erudit, linguas dirigit, uirtutes et sanitates facit, opera mirabilia

2 datus...commodatus *a*: -at...-at *al.* 4 per γ Pa.: post *corr.* Latin., Ja. 17 qui Mign. *typogr. err.*

4 sq. Jo. xiv 16, 17: xv 26: xvi 7: xvi 13. The Vulg. has *Paracletus* throughout, in place of *aduocatus*, with other variations; e.g. for *diriget in*, ὁδηγήσει εἰς, it has *docebit*.

13. **pupillos**] In the Vulg. of Jo. xiv 18 the word is 'orphanos': the legal term *pupillus*, 'a ward,' is correlative to *tutor*, the 'guardian.'

16. **distinxit**] 'has brought out clearly' or 'emphasized' the Gospel mysteries: cp. what is said of 'evangelical law' in p. 106 lines 12, 13 above.

21, 23. **dirigit**] Probably the word is used in the old Latin sense given by Facciolati 'in duas partes diuidere,' as the equivalent of διαμερίζειν in Acts ii 3. The grammarian Paulus (p. 69 M.) says 'dirigere apud Plautum inuenitur pro discidere.' So we may tr. 'distribute' here.

23. **sanitates**] so 1 Cor. xii 9 'gratia sanitatum in uno Spiritu.' N. gives the word the sense of 'cures'; so pp. 29. 10, 40. 14. *Discretiones spirituum* ib. *v.* 10, 'discerning of spirits,' i.e. 'determination between those prophetical gifts

gerit, discretiones spirituum porrigit, gubernationes contribuit, consilia suggerit, quaeque alia sunt charismatum dona componit et digerit; et ideo ecclesiam domini undique et in omnibus perfectam et consummatam facit.

Hic est qui in modum columbae, posteaquam dominus baptizatus est, super eum uenit et mansit, habitans in solo Christo plenus et totus, nec in aliqua mensura aut portione mutilatus, sed cum tota sua redundantia cumulate distributus et missus, ut ex illo delibationem quandam gratiarum ceteri consequi possint, totius sancti spiritus in Christo fonte remanente, ut ex illo donorum atque operum uenae ducerentur, spiritu sancto in Christo affluenter habitante. hoc etenim iam prophetans Isaias aiebat: *et requiescet*, inquit, *super eum spiritus sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consilii et uirtutis, spiritus scientiae et pietatis, et implebit eum spiritus timoris dei.* hoc idem atque ipsum et alio in loco ex persona ipsius domini: *spiritus domini super me; propter quod unxit me, euangelizare pauperibus misit me.* similiter Dauid: *propterea*

8 cumulate d. et missus Pa *ex α*: cumulate admissus *γ al.* 13 requiescit...impleuit *edd. uet.*: *corr.* edd. Angl.

which were true and those which were false' (Stanley *ad loc.*).

6. Matt. iii 16, Jo. i 33.

7. 'Not abridged in any measure or portion, but in His full outflow bountifully dispensed and sent forth.' In Jo. iii 34, 'He giveth not the Spirit by measure,' a general principle is laid down; but N., like our A.V. and many ancient interpreters, understood the words to mean 'giveth not unto Him.'

9. **ex illo**] sc. 'ex Christo,' as also in l. 11.

ib. **delibationem**] 'taste' or 'sample.' In Rom. xi 16 (Vulg.) the word represents ἀπαρχή 'firstfruits.'

10. **totius ... remanente**] In Christ the entire fulness of the Spirit abides, like an ever-springing fountain, from which other men receive their particular streams of grace. Novatian, it will be observed, is not speaking of the eternal Procession of the Spirit from the Son, but of the gift bestowed upon Christ at His baptism for the benefit of men.

13. Is. xi 2, 3. For 'uirtutis' (LXX ἰσχύος) Vulg. has *fortitudinis.*

17. 'This self-same thing the prophet has said in another passage, in the person of the Lord Himself.' The quotation (from Is. lxi 1) is a literal rendering of the striking words of LXX, especially εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς. Vulg. agrees in Luke iv 18, but in Isaiah reads *ad annuntiandum mansuetis.* On this punctuation, which connects 'euangelizare' with 'misit,' see Moulton *Grammar of N. T. Greek* i p. 143. It is accepted in the recent edition of the Vulg. by Eb. Nestle.

18. Ps. xliv 8 (xlv 7).

unxit te, deus, deus tuus oleo laetitiae a consortibus tuis. de hoc apostolus Paulus: *qui enim spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius*; et: *ubi spiritus domini, ibi libertas.*

Hic est qui operatur ex aquis secundam natiuitatem, semen quoddam diuini generis, et consecrator caelestis natiuitatis, pignus promissae hereditatis, et quasi chirographum quoddam aeternae salutis; qui nos dei faciat templum, et nos eius efficiat domum. qui interpellat diuinas aures pro nobis gemitibus ineloquacibus, aduocationis implens officia, et defensionis exhibens munera, inhabitator corporibus nostris datus, et sanctitatis effector; qui id agens in nobis ad aeternitatem et ad resurrectionem immortalitatis corpora nostra producat, dum illa in se assuefacit cum caelesti uirtute misceri, et cum spiritus sancti diuina aeternitate sociari. erudiuntur enim in illo et per ipsum corpora nostra ad immortalitatem proficere, dum ad

1 te, deus, deus tuus *sic legitur apud Tertull.* adu. Prax. xiii.

2. Rom. viii 9.

3. 2 Cor. iii 17.

4. Two centuries later, Theodoret affirmed (*Haer. Fab.* iii 5) that the Novatianist sect refused to practise Unction in connexion with Baptism: and in the present striking passage, the 'seal' of Unction and the Laying-on of Hands is not mentioned. Dr Mason (*Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 122) thinks that the writer's 'silence concerning the "seal" may be interpreted as in the case of other ancient authors who ascribe the gift of the Holy Ghost to "Baptism";—Baptism implicitly including it.' The twofold occurrence in the passage of the word *unxit*, in the quotations, makes for that view. Cornelius, Bp of Rome, in a letter to Fabius, Bp of Antioch, says that Novatian was privately baptized in sickness: and affirms that 'when he recovered, he never obtained the remaining things which a man ought to partake of according to the Church rule, and was never sealed by the Bishop.' On this question *v.* Mason, *op. cit.* p. 120; Bp Hall, *Confirmation* (Oxf. Library of Practical Theology) p. 69.

6. Eph. i 14.

7. 1 Cor. iii 17. 'Faciat... efficiat' are causal subjunctives, as is *producat*, l. 12.

9. Rom. viii 26 Vulg. 'inenarrabilibus.'

11. **qui id agens** sq.] 'So doing in us to bring our bodies to eternity and to the resurrection of immortality, while He accustoms them in His own person [*or rather*, in Himself] to be conjoined with heavenly powers and to be associated with the Divine eternity of the Holy Spirit' (Mason *l.c.*). For 'producat' cp. p. 63. 11. The passage proceeds from the thought of the indwelling Spirit to that of a transfigured humanity, 'heavenly,' 'immortal,' 'divine.' Dr Moberly (*Atonement*, p. 275) speaks of 'the universal principle, that the Pentecostal Church *is* Πνεῦμα; and therefore that everything in the Church is what it is only within the region, and informing principle, of Spirit.' Cf. *Introd.* § 6.

decreta ipsius discunt se moderanter temperare. hic est enim qui *contra carnem desiderat*, quia *caro contra ipsum repugnat*. hic est qui inexplebiles cupiditates coercet, immoderatas libidines frangit, illicitos ardores exstinguit, flagrantes impetus uincit, ebrietates reicit, auaritias repellit, luxuriosas comissationes fugat, caritates nectit, affectiones constringit, sectas repellit, regulam ueritatis expedit, haereticos reuincit, improbos foras exspuit, euangelia custodit.

De hoc idem apostolus: *non enim spiritum mundi accepimus, sed spiritum qui ex deo est.* de hoc exsultat, et dicit: *puto autem quia et ego spiritum dei habeo.* de hoc dicit: *et spiritus prophetarum prophetis subiectus est.* de hoc refert: *spiritus autem manifeste dicit, quia in nouissimis temporibus recedent quidam a fide, attendentes spiritibus seductoribus, doctrinis daemoniorum, in hypocrisi mendacia loquentium, cauteriatam habentium conscientiam suam.* in hoc spiritu positus *nemo umquam dicit anathema Iesum:* nemo negauit Christum dei filium, aut repudiauit creatorem deum: nemo contra scripturas ulla sua uerba depromit: nemo alia et sacrilega decreta constituit: nemo diuersa iura conscribit. in hunc quisquis

6 fugit *edd.*: *corr.* We. 9 item *edd.*: *corr.* Pa. Cf. p. 93 l. 11. 17 Iesu Mign.

2. Gal. v 17.

7. **expedit**] Cp. above, c. xxiv p. 90 l. 3.

8. 'Is keeper of the Gospels.' This can only be said of the Spirit, as being the keeper of the Church 'in perpetual virginity and truth' (end of this ch., lines 8, 9). Thus we have in these words, and in line 5 below ('incontaminata doctrinae dominicae iura custodit'), a third-century affirmation of the principle that 'the Church is witness and keeper of Holy Writ' (Art. xx).

9. 1 Cor. ii 12.

10. 1 Cor. vii 40.

11. **spiritus ... subiectus est**] The right reading of the original (1 Cor. xiv 32) gives the plural: but *v.* Tischendorf *in loc.*, who cites for the singular some good authorities, including four uncial MSS.

12. 1 Tim. iv 1.

17. **anathema Iesum**] 1 Cor. xii 3 where Vulg. has *Iesu*. The best attested reading in the Greek is Ἰησοῦς: while Ἰησοῦ has only one uncial in its favour.

19. **decreta**] Like the words above (l. 1) 'ad decreta ipsius discunt se moderanter temperare,' this refers to the particular rulings of the Spirit in the Church. Cp. the use of the verb in Novatian's letter (Cypr. *Ep.* xxxvi 1) 'quod contra euangelicam decretum uidetur ueritatem.' For *sacrilegus* as an epithet of heresy, cp. note on p. 112 l. 5.

blasphemauerit, *remissionem non habet, non tantum in isto saeculo, uerum etiam nec in futuro.* hic in apostolis Christo testimonium reddit, in martyribus constantem fidem religionis ostendit, in uirginibus admirabilem continentiam signatae castitatis includit, in ceteris incorrupta et incontaminata doctrinae dominicae iura custodit, haereticos destruit, peruersos corrigit, infideles arguit, simulatores ostendit, improbos quoque corrigit, ecclesiam incorruptam et inuiolatam perpetuae uirginitatis et ueritatis sanctitate custodit.

30 XXX. Et haec quidem de patre et de filio et de spiritu sancto breuiter sint nobis dicta, et strictim posita, et non longa disputatione porrecta. latius enim potuerunt porrigi, et propensiore disputatione produci, quandoquidem ad testimonium, quod ita se habeat fides uera, totum et uetus et nouum testamentum possit adduci. sed quia obluctantes aduersus

5 charitatis *edd.*: *corr.* We.

1. Matt. xii 32 Vulg. 'non remittetur ei neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro.'

5. **includit**] Probably a concealed reference to Cant. iv 12 'hortus *conclusus* soror mea sponsa, fons signatus.'

8. **uirginitatis**] Cp. 2 Cor. xi 2: and see the letter of the Church of Lyons (Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* vi 40) τῇ παρθένῳ μητρί.

FOURTH PART. *On the Unity of the Godhead.* This closing section of the treatise, although it involves some repetition of what has been already said, is not a mere appendix. It is necessary to the completeness of the scheme of the book. The first three sections have dealt with the doctrine (to use later language) of 'Three Persons'; this last deals with that of 'One God.'

XXX. *Brief as our discussion is, we have yet to shew that the belief that Christ is God does not traverse the belief that there is One God, as the heretics have argued who have held Him to be either God the Father, or mere man. Christ is really once more crucified between two thieves. They are blind to the plain statements of Scripture. We hold that there is One God, Maker of heaven and earth. But we may not neglect any portion of Scripture: and the Scriptural proofs of Christ's Divinity are plain. There is only One God: yet Christ was addressed as 'My Lord and my God.' Reverence and logic will reconcile the two truths. We may confront our opponents with analogies: it is stated that there is One Lord, and yet Christ is Lord: 'One Master,' and yet St Paul is called Master: 'One alone good,' yet Christ is good. If apparent contradiction is reconciled in those cases, why not also in this?*

12. **propensiore**] 'more solid,' lit. 'weighing heavier in the scale.' Gallandius tr. 'more extended,' referring to Persius i 57 (where, however, Conington adopts the variant *protenso*). Jackson corrects *propansiore*.

15. **obluctantes** sq.] 'heretics,

ueritatem semper haeretici sincerae traditionis et catholicae fidei controuersiam solent trahere, scandalizati in Christum, quod etiam deus et per scripturas asseratur et a nobis hoc esse credatur, merito a nobis (ut omnis a fide nostra auferri possit haeretica calumnia) de eo quod et deus sit Christus sic est disputandum, ut non impediat scripturae ueritatem, sed nec nostram fidem, qua unus deus et per scripturas promitur, et a nobis tenetur et creditur.

tam enim illi qui Iesum Christum ipsum deum patrem dicunt, quam etiam illi qui hominem illum tantummodo esse uoluerunt, erroris sui et peruersitatis origines et causas inde rapuerunt, quia cum animaduerterent scriptum esse quod unus sit deus, non aliter putauerunt istam tenere se posse sententiam, nisi aut hominem tantum Christum, aut certe deum patrem putarent esse credendum. sic enim calumnias suas colligere consueuerunt, ut errorem proprium approbare nitantur. et quidem illi qui Iesum Christum patrem dicunt, ista praetendunt: si unus deus, Christus autem deus, pater est Christus, quia unus deus: si non pater sit Christus, dum et deus filius Christus, duo dii contra scripturas introducti esse

8 *edd.* promittitur *ut a*: *corr.* We promitur. 18 si unus deus Christus, Christus a. d. γ: *corr.* Pa.

ever wrestling against the truth, have a standing quarrel with the pure tradition and the Catholic faith, offended as they are at Christ.' For the gen. (objective in its character) with 'controuersiam,' cp. p. 99 l. 29 'controuersiam diuinitatis et religionis.'

5. **calumnia**] (as below) suggests 'captious objection.' Cp. *de Cib. Iud.* i 'haereticorum sacrilegis calumniis.'

ib. **de eo quod** cet.] 'We have to argue the fact that Christ is also God in such a way as not to interfere with the truth of Scripture nor yet with our Creed.' *Sic...ut non* really gives the gist of the argument.

8. **promitur**] 'is asserted,' as in xxiii, p. 84. 9 'ausi sint non filium sed ipsum deum patrem promere uel putare,' and xxvi, p. 94. 6. The reading 'promittitur' could only be rendered 'is professed'; cf. 1 Tim. ii 10 'promittentes pietatem.'

15. 'For they are wont to endeavour to recommend their peculiar error by throwing their false objections into the following logical form.' *Colligere* refers to the syllogistic form of the objection, as set out in the sentences following. Cp. xxv, p. 93. 11.

18. **si unus** sq.] This is the argument of the Patripassians.

19. **si non pater** sq.] 'If Christ is not the Father, then, as Christ, the Son, is God also, it must appear' etc.

uideantur. qui autem hominem tantummodo Christum esse contendunt, ex diuerso sic colligunt: si alter pater, alter est filius, pater autem deus, et Christus deus, non ergo unus deus, sed duo dii introducuntur pariter, pater et filius; ac si unus deus, consequenter homo Christus, ut merito pater sit deus unus. re uera quasi inter duos latrones cruci figitur dominus, quo modo fixus aliquando est: et ita excipit haereticorum istorum ex utroque latere sacrilega conuicia.

Sed neque scripturae sanctae, neque nos causas illis perditionis et caecitatis afferimus, si qua in medio diuinarum litterarum euidenter posita aut uidere nolunt, aut uidere non possunt. nos enim et scimus et legimus et credimus et tenemus unum esse deum, qui fecit caelum pariter ac terram, quoniam nec alterum nouimus aut nosse (cum nullus sit) aliquando poterimus. *ego sum*, inquit, *deus: et non est praeter me iustus et saluans.* et alio in loco: *ego primus et nouissimus, et praeter me non est deus. quis sicut ego?* et: *quis mensus est palmo caelum, et terram pugillo? quis suspendit montes in pondere, et nemora in statera?* et Ezechias: *ut sciant omnes quia tu es deus solus.* ipse praeterea dominus: *quid me interrogas de bono? unus deus bonus.* apostolus quoque Paulus: *qui solus*, inquit, *habet immortalitatem, et lucem habitat inaccessibilem; quem uidit hominum nemo, nec uidere potest.* et alio in loco: *mediator autem unius non est; deus autem unus est.* sed quo modo hoc tenemus et legimus et credimus, sic scriptu-

1 Christum esse contendunt *supplet* Pa *ex a.* 16 ego *ins.* Ja. *ante* nouissimus. 25 si...debemus? We. *coni.*

1. **qui autem hominem** sq.] the argument of the 'rationalistic' Monarchians or Adoptianists.

7. **excipit**] 'is exposed to.'

10. 'If there are things plainly laid down on the open page of the Bible which they either will not or cannot see.'

15. The ref. is to Isaiah xlv 21, following the LXX; not to Is. xliii 11.

16. **et nouissimus**] Is. xliv 6, 7. Jackson following Hebr. LXX and Vulg. inserts *ego* before *nouissimus*. The other quotations follow LXX.

17. Is. xl 12. See p. 10. 4.

19. 2 Kings xix 19, in the prayer of Hezekiah.

20. Matt. xix 17.

21. 1 Tim. vi 16.

24. Gal. iii 20.

ib. **sed quo modo** sq.] The sense is; just as we accept Scripture statements of the Unity of God, so

rarum caelestium nullam partem praeterire debemus: quippe cum etiam illa quae in scripturis sunt posita Christi diuinitatis insignia nullo modo debemus recusare, ne scripturarum auctoritatem corrumpendo integritatem fidei sanctae corrupisse teneamur. et hoc ergo credamus, siquidem fidelissimum, dei filium Iesum Christum dominum et deum nostrum: quoniam *in principio erat uerbum, et uerbum erat apud deum, et deus erat uerbum. hoc erat in principio apud deum. et uerbum caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis.* et: *dominus meus et deus meus.* et: *quorum patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia deus benedictus in saecula.*

Quid ergo dicemus? numquid duos deos scriptura proponit? quomodo ergo dicit, quia *deus unus est?* aut numquid non et Christus deus est? quomodo ergo, *dominus meus et deus meus,* Christo dictum est? totum igitur hoc nisi cum propria ueneratione et legitima disputatione teneamus, merito scandalum haereticis praebuisse credemur, non utique ex scripturarum caelestium uitio, quae numquam fallunt, sed humani erroris praesumptione, qua haeretici esse uoluerunt. et in primis illud retorquendum in istos qui duorum nobis deorum controuersiam facere praesumunt. scriptum est, quod negare non possunt, quoniam *unus est dominus.* de Christo ergo quid sentiunt? dominum esse, aut illum omnino non esse? sed dominum illum omnino non dubitant: ergo si

5 si quidem fideles sumus Wower. *emend.* 7 apud deum] deus edd., *corr.* Ja. 17 dispositione Ja. *coni.* 20 qua *a*: quia edd. veteres.

ought we to accept unreservedly every part of Scripture. Thus Welchman's emendation is unnecessary.

5. **siquidem fidelissimum** sq.] 'since it is a most faithful saying that Jesus Christ...is our Lord and God,' cp. 'fidelis sermo,' 1 Tim. i 15.

7. Jo. i 1, 2, 14.

9. Jo. xx 28: see p. 44. 19.

10. On the passage Rom. ix 5 cp. n. on ch. xiii, p. 44. 13.

17. **disputatione**] 'dialectic.' Jackson emends to *dispositione* from ch. xv *sub fin.*

20. **qua haeretici** sq.] Pamelius marks the play on the root-meaning of *haeresis*, 'choice,' as *praesumptio* means 'self-will.' Cp. note on p. 101 l. 8.

23. Deut. vi 4.

uera est illorum ratiocinatio, iam duo sunt domini. quomodo igitur iam secundum scripturas unus est dominus? et *magister unus* Christus est dictus; attamen legimus, quod magister sit etiam apostolus Paulus. non ergo iam unus magister: duos enim magistros secundum ista colligimus. quomodo igitur secundum scripturas *unus magister Christus?* *unus* in scripturis *bonus* dictus est *deus;* sed iisdem in scripturis bonus etiam Christus positus est. non igitur, si recte colligunt, unus bonus, sed etiam duo boni. quomodo igitur secundum scripturarum fidem unus bonus esse refertur? ac si non putant aliqua ratione offici posse ei quod unus dominus est, per illud quod est dominus et Christus; neque ei quod unus est magister, per illud quod est magister et Paulus; aut illi quod unus est bonus, per illud quod bonus sit nuncupatus et Christus; eadem ratione intellegant offici non posse ab illo quod unus est deus, ei quod deus pronuntiatus est et Christus.

31 XXXI. Est ergo deus pater omnium institutor et crea-

2 unus est dominus et magister unus Christus dictus? at enim legimus Pa. edd. Angl. *emendauerunt.* 7 unus...est deus *suppl.* Pa *ex* α. 7 idem We. *coni.* 11 ac si Pa *ex* α: at *al.* 13 illud γ: id *cett.* 16 ab illo quod unus est deus ei quod] ei quod unus est deus per hoc quod We.

3. Matt. xxiii 8.
4. 2 Tim. i 11.
7. Matt. xix 17.
11. **aliqua ratione offici posse cet.**] 'that it can be any obstacle to the truth that there is one Lord, that Christ also is Lord.'

XXXI. *There is One God, without origin, of attributes incomparable. From Him, when He willed it, the Word was begotten: the secret of His nativity is known to none, save only to Himself: who has always been in the Father. The Son is before all time; the Father is always Father, without origin, and therefore antecedent to the Son, who is begotten of Him, and, as such, is less than He is. Through that Divine Being, the Word, all things were made. Necessarily then Christ is before all things but after the Father, God of God, the Second Person as being the Son. His Divinity does not take from the Father the glory of being the One God. Christ is God, not as a Being unborn, unbegotten, without origin; not as being Himself the Father, not as invisible and past comprehension. To give Him those attributes were to affirm two Gods. But the Son is what He is not of Himself but from the Father. He is the Only-begotten and First-begotten, the Beginning of all things, who attests the One God as First Origin of being. He does nothing of His own counsel, but ministers*

tor, solus originem nesciens, inuisibilis, immensus, immortalis, aeternus, unus deus; cuius neque magnitudini neque maiestati neque uirtuti quicquam, non dixerim praeferri, sed nec comparari potest. ex quo, quando ipse uoluit, sermo filius natus est: qui non in sono percussi aeris, aut tono coactae de uisceribus uocis accipitur, sed in substantia prolatae a deo uirtutis agnoscitur. cuius sacrae et diuinae natiuitatis arcana nec apostolus didicit, nec prophetes comperit, nec angelus sciuit, nec creatura cognouit; filio soli nota sunt, qui patris secreta cognouit.

to the will of the Father, thus by obedience proving the truth of the One God. Christ then is God begotten to be God and Lord and Angel. There is no discordance of attributes that would imply the existence of two Gods. The Divine virtue of the One God bestowed on the Son returns upon Himself in the community of the Divine substance. The Son is Lord and God of all else, by His authority received from the Father. Thus the Father is rightly proved to be the One only True God.

1. **originem nesciens**] 'without origin': the classicism is rather misleading here. Cp. the description of the Stoic 'qui nesciat [=nequeat] irasci,' Juv. x 60.

4. **quando ipse uoluit**] i.e. 'when *the Father* willed': compare p. 118. 5, *quando Pater uoluit.* The same thought appears in Hippolytus *c. Noetum*, chs. x, xi. Cp. also Dorner I ii 86, who quotes from that Father, 'when it was God's will, He shewed His Logos as He willed, at the times afore appointed by Him.' On this question see Petavius *de Trinitate*, vi 8. The tendency of these earlier Fathers is to regard the Trinity as 'oeconomic,' not 'hypostatic,' i.e. to treat the indication of distinctions in the Divine Nature as relative to the Divine action in time, rather than as absolute and eternal. Dorner remarks upon this subject, 'distinctions confirm unity, for a unity evolved out of distinctions is more compact and self-sufficient' (*ib.* 83). On the analogy of human personality see Dr Illingworth, *Personality Human and Divine*, pp. 67—71, and Note 12.

5. **non in sono...**] 'who is not understood as a sound that strikes the air or a tone of the voice forced from the lungs, but is acknowledged in the sense of a substantive power put forth by God.' Cf. Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* iii 8, § 6 sq. The words are plainly directed against the Modalist definition of the Logos in Stoic terms, as *ἀὴρ πεπληγμένος ἢ τὸ ἴδιον αἰσθητὸν ἀκοῆς* (Diog. Laert. 55). The writer follows Tertullian *adu. Prax.* vii 'quid est enim, dices, sermo nisi uox et sonus oris et, sicut grammatici tradunt, aër offensus?' Hippol. *Philos.* x 33 *Θεὸς λόγον ἀπογεννᾷ, οὐ λόγον ὡς φωνήν.* Harnack, *D. G.* i[3] 697 n.

6. **in substantia** cet.] N. uses the word 'substantia' in this chapter to represent *ὑπόστασις*, in a sense verging upon that of 'person,' not in its usual sense of 'substance' or 'essence' (Heb. i 3); cp. p. 118. 7, 8 'substantia illa diuina, cuius nomen est uerbum' 'Being.' In p. 57. 24 we have 'in substantia fuit Christus ante mundi institutionem,' 'personal essence.'

Hic ergo, cum sit genitus a patre, semper est in patre. semper autem sic dico, ut non innatum, sed natum probem. sed qui ante omne tempus est, semper in patre fuisse dicendus est: nec enim tempus illi assignari potest, qui ante tempus est. semper enim in patre, ne pater non semper sit pater. quia et pater illum etiam praecedit, quod necesse est prior sit, qua pater sit: quoniam antecedat necesse est eum,

6 quia *a*: quin *al.* 6 sq. quadam ratione praecedit: quodam modo prior: aliquo pacto antecedat G *γ*.

1. **hic ergo cum sit genitus** sq.] Generation from the Father implies, N. says, that the Son was always in the Father. This step in the argument he does not explain; but probably he means that such a relationship, in the case of the Divine Being, must necessarily be eternal.

2. **semper autem sic** sq.] N. must wish to combat one of two errors. As the Son is always in the Father, it might be thought that His birth had not already taken place, before all time. Or, for the same reason, it might be thought that the Son has no birth at all, but has an independent and self-originated existence. In the former case, 'innatum' would mean 'not yet born.' But the use of 'natus' and 'innatus' below (p. 119. 5 sq.) is conclusive for the latter view. N. says therefore that this coeternal existence of the Son does not mean an independent existence, but a derivative one; only (*sed*), where questions of time are out of place, we must say that this derived existence has 'always' been. *v.* Introd. § 4, p. xxxvii.

ib. **innatum**] 'unborn,' 'ingenerate.' Bp Bull (*op. cit.* p. 478), while charging the writer with 'expressing himself in a most perplexed manner,' says, 'it is most certain that he altogether shrunk from the [subsequent] Arian blasphemy respecting the Son of God, "there was a time when He was not" (*ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*).'

5. **ne pater non semper** cet.] This argument for the eternity of the Son is implied in the words of Irenaeus iv 11. 5 (Harvey), in connexion with 'reuelauerit' of Matt. xi 27 (Luke x 22) 'non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tunc inceperit uerbum manifestare patrem, cum de Maria natus; sed communitas per totum tempus positum est. Ab initio enim assistens filius suo plasmati reuelat omnibus patrem.' It appears again in Origen *Princ.* i 2. 10, iv 28.

6. **quia et pater** cet.] It is clear that in the supposed interests of orthodoxy as against Arianism some liberties have been taken with the original text of this chapter. The qualifying phrases *quadam ratione*, and in the next clause *quodam modo*, and in the following sentence *aliquo pacto* before *antecedat*, were wanting in *cod. Angl.* but interpolated (according to Pamelius) by Gangneius. The ed. of Gelenius reads them without brackets. At the same time these interpolations fairly represent the mind of N., for the whole context shews that he did not intend 'praecedit' to have a strictly temporal sense. Again, the sentence *simul ut hic minor* to *nascitur*, and lower down the words *sed post Patrem*, and again *post Patrem qua Filius*, are due to *cod. Angl.*: Gelenius omits them. Cf. n. on p. 119. 16 below.

qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit; simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habens originem, quia nascitur, et per patrem quodam modo, quamuis originem habet, qua nascitur, uicinus in natiuitate, dum ex eo patre, qui originem solus non habet, nascitur. hic ergo quando pater uoluit, processit ex patre: et qui in patre fuit, quia ex patre fuit, cum patre postmodum fuit, quia ex patre processit, substantia scilicet illa diuina, cuius nomen est uerbum, per quod facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil. omnia enim post ipsum sunt, quia per ipsum sunt, et merito ipse est ante omnia, sed post patrem, quando per illum facta sunt omnia.

1—5 simul ut hic...non habet nascitur *a*: *om.* *γ*. *Sed* uicinis *a*: *corr.* Pa. 2 quia] qua F. Jun. *coni.* 6 processit ex patre: et qui in patre fuit] *haec uerba per dittographiam repetita exhibent* edd. priores. 7 cum patre postmodum fuit] et cum p. fuit (ed. Paris. 1545). 11 sed post patrem *a*: *om.* *γ* Pa.

1. **simul ut hic minor sit...**] sc. *necesse est*. 'At the same time He must be less, as knowing that He is in Him, having an origin, in that He is born; and, though He has an origin in so far as He is born, yet, through His Father, He is somehow not far removed in His birth from Him, as being born of that Father who alone is without origin.' On this view of the passage, the *et* couples *uicinus* to *habens originem*: and the strange expression *uicinus in natiuitate* is meant to correct or modify the impression left by *habens originem*. The sentiment 'uicinus...nascitur' may be illustrated by Greg. Naz. *Or. Theol.* iii 11 εἰ καὶ μέγα τῷ πατρὶ τὸ μηδαμόθεν ὡρμῆσθαι, οὐκ ἔλαττον τῷ υἱῷ τὸ ἐκ τοιούτου πατρός. τῆς γὰρ τοῦ ἀναιτίου δόξης μετέχοι ἄν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀναιτίου. The word *uicinus* in later Latin frequently denotes close similarity or kinship: and here expresses proximity, not in time, but in nature. It is not necessary with H. Jordan (*Theologie...Novatians* p. 98) to understand the writer to suggest, by a gross misuse of terms, a *natiuitas* of the First Person of the Trinity, to which the Son is 'uicinus,'—i.e. nearly simultaneous,—not even (as he says) in order to 'carry back the beginning of the Son as far as possible.'

5. **hic ergo** cet.] resumes from p. 116. 4 ex quo, quando ipse uoluit.

6. **processit ex patre**] The same writer dwells rightly on the fact that N. calls that eternal generation *processio* (προέλευσις, a going forth), as did Athenagoras: the term implying that He was in the Father before He proceeded from the Father, as the Creating Word. Cp. 50. 14, 15 'ex deo quomodo homo non processit, sic dei uerbum processit.' See Introd. § 3, p. xxxii.

6. **quia ex patre fuit**] repeats the reason in p. 117 l. 1 'cum sit genitus a patre, semper est in patre.'

7. **cum patre postmodum fuit**] viz. after the 'natiuitas': so 'postmodum secundum carnem hominem,' c. xvii p. 59. 13.

ib. **substantia**] Cp. n. on p. 116. 6 above.

11. **quando per illum** sq.] The stress is on the 'per.' It suggests

qui processit ex eo, ex cuius uoluntate facta sunt omnia, deus utique procedens ex deo, secundam personam efficiens post patrem, qua filius, sed non eripiens illud patri, quod unus est deus.

Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, aequatione in utroque ostensa, duos faceret innatos, et ideo duos faceret deos. si non genitus esset, collatus cum eo qui genitus non esset, et aequales inuenti, duos deos merito reddidissent non geniti; atque ideo duos Christus reddidisset deos. si sine origine esset ut pater, inuentus et ipse principium omnium ut pater, duo faciens principia, duos ostendisset nobis consequenter et deos. aut si et ipse filius non esset, sed pater generans de se alterum filium, merito collatus cum patre et tantus denotatus, duos patres effecisset, et ideo duos approbasset etiam deos. si inuisibilis fuisset, cum inuisibili collatus, par expressus, duos inuisibiles ostendisset, et ideo duos comprobasset et deos. si incomprehensibilis, si et cetera quaecumque

2 post patrem qua filius *a om.* Pa. 6 ostensa Pa *ex a pro* ostensi. 16 *uerba* si inuisibilis fuisset *usque ad* quia nec innatus est *suppl. ex a* Pa: *quorum in loco* Christus autem non innatus est *legebant uett. ut* ed. Paris. 1545.

that Another exists beyond Him, whose agent He is.

6. **qui esset innatus**] The subjunctive is assimilated to the hypothetical subjunctive on which it depends: and therefore the alteration of *esset* to *est* (by Welchman) is unnecessary: and similarly in line 8 'genitus non esset.' The general sense is: 'had He not been born, as unborn He would be brought into comparison with the Father who is unborn, and, an equality on either side appearing, He would make a second unborn, and therefore two Gods.' In the parallel statement which follows, *collatus cum eo* is regarded as a composite subject, taken up by *aequales inuenti* and completed by a plural verb.

14. **tantus denotatus**] 'being set down as great as He.' Cp. p. 57. 25 'quibus posterior (Christus) denotatur': and p. 13. 13 note.

16. The omission of the sentences *si inuisibilis fuisset* down to *nec innatus est* was evidently due to theological considerations. On the 'uisibilitas' of the Son see above p. 61. 11 n., p. 103 l. 20 sq.

18. **incomprehensibilis**] Note that this is not the 'incomprehensible' of the 'Quicumque Vult,' which represents *immensus*, ἀχώρητος. This appears from Iren. iv 34. 6, on the vision of God: ὁ ἀχώρητος καὶ ἀκατάληπτος καὶ ἀόρατος, ὁρώμενον ἑαυτὸν καὶ καταλαμβανόμενον καὶ χωρούμενον τοῖς πιστοῖς παρέσχεν, where the Latin rendering is 'in-

sunt patris, merito, dicimus, duorum deorum quam isti confingunt controuersiam suscitasset. nunc autem quicquid est, non ex se est, quia nec innatus est, sed ex patre est, quia genitus est. siue dum uerbum est, siue dum uirtus est, siue dum sapientia est, siue dum lux est, siue dum filius est, et quicquid horum est, dum non aliunde est, quam, sicut diximus iam superius, ex patre, patri suo originem suam debens, discordiam diuinitatis de numero duorum deorum facere non potuit, qui ex illo, qui est unus deus, originem nascendo contraxit. quo genere, dum et unigenitus est et primogenitus ex illo est qui, quia originem non habet, unus est omnium rerum et principium et caput, idcirco unum deum asseruit, quem non sub ullo principio aut initio, sed initium potius et principium rerum omnium comprobauit.

Idem est denique quod nihil ex arbitrio suo gerit, nec ex consilio suo facit, nec a se uenit, sed imperiis paternis omnibus et praeceptis oboedit: ut quamuis probet illum natiuitas filium, tamen morigera oboedientia asserat illum paternae uoluntatis, ex quo est, ministrum. ita dum se patri in omnibus obtem-

11 qui quia ed. Paris 1545: qui *a* Pa: quia *al.* 12 idcirco unum deum adseruit G *quem sequitur* Pa: i. u. d. oportet adserere ed. Paris. 1545. 13 initium potius et principium Pa *ex a.* 15 *sic γ*: filius autem nihil G Pa.

capabilis et incomprehensibilis [et inuisibilis].'

2. **quicquid est**] cp. p. 98 l. 1 with note.

7. **patri suo originem...**] 'owing His origin to the Father, He could not occasion any variance in the Divine Essence by making two Gods; for He drew His origin by generation from the One God. In this aspect, while He is both the Only-begotten, and the First-begotten from Him who is without origin, there is but One who is the beginning and head of all things.' *De numero duorum* expresses the means by which *discordia* would be made: and is best explained by the words of p. 37 ll. 17—19. *Quo genere* is a logical term, *genus* denoting a 'class of facts' or 'subject': thus Quintil. (*Inst. Or.* x 7. 31) has *in hoc genere.* In p. 88 l. 4 'alio genere aduersus illos reluctandum,' the use is slightly different.

12. **idcirco...asseruit**] *Idcirco* takes up *dum* (l. 10); for the sense, cp. the closing words of the chapter. The subject of *comprobauit* (and of 'asseruit') must be 'Christ,' not 'Scriptura' as Pamelius suggests.

15. **idem est denique quod nihil**] 'It is, accordingly, of the same import that He does nothing of His own will or counsel.' *Idem* is neuter.

19. **ex quo est**] referring to *paternae* (=patris).

perantem reddit, quamuis sit et deus, unum tamen deum patrem de oboedientia sua ostendit, ex quo et originem traxit.

Et ideo duos deos facere non potuit, quia nec duas origines fecit, qui ex eo, qui originem non habet, principium natiuitatis ante omne tempus accepit. nam cum id sit principium ceteris quod innatum est (quod deus solus pater est, qui extra originem est, ex quo hic est qui natus est), dum qui ex illo nascitur merito ex eo uenit, qui originem non habet, principium probans illud esse, ex quo ipse est, etiamsi deus est qui natus est, unum tamen deum ostendit, quem hic qui natus est esse sine origine comprobauit.

Est ergo deus, sed in hoc ipsum genitus, ut esset deus. est et dominus, sed in hoc ipsum natus ex patre, ut esset dominus. est et angelus, sed ad annuntiandum magnum dei consilium ex patre suo angelus destinatus. cuius sic diuinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantia aut inaequalitate diuinitatis duos deos

3 deos *ins.* We. 4 eo...] deo quia originem habet ed. Paris. 1545. 6, 7 quod deus...natus est Pa *ex a*. 15 cuius sic diuinitas...inaequalitate diuinitatis Pa *ex a*: *om.* aut...aut inaequalitate G, ed. Paris. 1545: *habet* aequalitate Ja.

2. **de oboedientia**] 'by His obedience,' as *supra* p. 120. 8 'de numero.' For N.'s teaching about the Son's obedience, see above p. 38. 15, p. 81. 13—p. 82. 4, p. 96. 10—13, p. 99. 19—21.

12. **in hoc ipsum genitus, ut**] does not specify the purpose, but the result. 'Gignere in deum' is a frequent expression in Hilary.

15. **angelus destinatus**] See p. 64. 15—18.

ib. **cuius sic diuinitas...uideatur**] There is a difficulty about *inaequalitate*, in view of the earlier words of the chapter: 'si non genitus esset, collatus cum eo qui genitus non esset, et aequales inuenti, duos deos merito reddidissent non geniti.' One might almost (with Jackson and Maran. *Divin. J. C.* iv 19. 2 quoted in Migne) have rather expected *aequalitate*, particularly after *aut*. But here the writer is not thinking of origin, but of Divine substance and attributes. 'His Divinity is so transmitted [by the Father] as not to let it appear, by any discord or inequality in its attributes, to imply two Gods.' Cp. *supra*, 'discordiam diuinitatis.' The two phrases *inaequalitate* and *dissonantia* may be thus explained. If the Godhead of the one were a different thing from the Godhead of the other, there could not but be two Gods. Or if the two could be conceived of as having the same Godhead, and yet standing in no accordant relation, there would be two Gods. But if the Godhead of the one is wholly derived from the other, and absolutely the same thing, then the unity of the Godhead is maintained. For *traditur* cp. p. 122. 5 'traduntur,' *ib.* 8 'tradita,' and *ib.* 10.

reddidisse uideatur. subiectis enim ei quasi filio omnibus rebus a patre, dum ipse cum his, quae illi subiecta sunt, patri suo subicitur, patris quidem sui filius probatur; ceterorum autem et dominus et deus esse reperitur. ex quo dum huic qui est deus omnia substrata traduntur, et cuncta sibi subiecta filius accepta refert patri, totam diuinitatis auctoritatem rursus patri remittit. unus deus ostenditur uerus et aeternus pater, a quo solo haec uis diuinitatis emissa, etiam in filium tradita et directa, rursum substantiae per communionem ad patrem reuoluitur. deus quidem ostenditur filius, cui diuinitas tradita et porrecta conspicitur; et tamen nihilominus unus deus pater probatur, dum gradatim reciproco meatu illa maiestas atque diuinitas ad patrem, qui dederat eam, rursum ab illo ipso filio missa reuertitur et retorquetur; ut merito deus pater omnium deus sit, et principium ipsius quoque filii sui, quem

2 dum ipse cum his quà illi subiecta sunt patri suo subiicitur *suppl.* Pa *ex* α, *om.* ed. Paris. 1545. 7 patri remittit: unus α, Pa: illi remittit unde unus ed. Paris. 1545, γ. 15 et principium ipsius quoque filii sui Pa *ex* α: *om.* ipsius quoque γ.

1. **subiectis** cet.] Perhaps there is a reference to 1 Cor. xv 25 foll.

4. **huic qui est deus**] Sc. Christo.

5. **et cuncta sibi...patri**] 'and the Son is indebted to the Father for the subjection of all things to Himself.'

7. **remittit**] 'refers back,' with the idea of waiving personal claim.

ib. 'The Father is shewn to be the One God, true and eternal: from whom alone this power of Divinity is emitted; and though transmitted to the Son and centred on Him, it reverts back again to the Father through their community of substance.' 'Directa' is used as in p. 107. 20 'quae...spiritus ecclesiae... distribuit et dirigit,' *ib.* 23 'linguas dirigit.'

10. The meaning of 'reuoluitur' becomes clearer from what follows.

12. **dum gradatim** cet.] 'while step by step that majesty and Divinity returning on themselves are brought round and reflected back by the Son Himself upon the Father who gave them.' The underlying metaphor is probably that of the heavenly bodies in motion. So p. 2 l. 8 'meatibus' is used of the heavenly bodies. It is often supposed that N., like Tertullian before him and Marcellus after, teaches a future re-absorption of the Son into the Father. But of this there is here no trace. The verbs are in the present tense, not the future. N. is laying down the doctrine of what was later called περιχώρησις, a mutual and intimate relationship of the Divine Persons, each dwelling in other; though he has hardly reached the doctrine of the Spirit as the 'nexus Trinitatis' which appears at a later time. See Introd. § 5, pp. xlix, l.

dominum genuit: filius autem ceterorum omnium deus sit, quoniam omnibus illum deus pater praeposuit, quem genuit. ita *mediator dei et hominum Christus Iesus*, omnis creaturae subiectam sibi habens a patre proprio potestatem, qua deus est, cum tota creatura subdita sibi, concors patri suo deo inuentus, unum et solum et uerum deum patrem suum, manente in illo quod etiam *auditus est*, breuiter approbauit.

5 suo] sub Migne *err. typogr.* 7 manente in illo...auditus est γ Pa: manentem in se quod audiuit ab illo G: manens et in illo cui etiam subditus est *emend.* Ja *collato* c. xviii p. 64. 16, 17: manens et in illo quod etiam subditum est H. Jordan (*Theol. Nov.* p. 108).

3. **mediator dei** sq.] 1 Tim. ii 5: cp. ch. xxiii, p. 85. 14.

5. **concors**] The opposite of the 'discordia' and 'dissonantia' above.

7. **manente in illo quod etiam auditus est**] The passage is so obscure that, like Pamelius, 'locum aliis castigandum relinquimus.' As it stands, it can only be explained by supposing *quod etiam auditus est* to be a reference to Hebr. v 7. But, apart from the fact that Novatian does not appear to have regarded the Ep. to the Hebrews as a canonical authority, a stylist like Novatian could hardly have thus written in his peroration. No satisfactory emendation has appeared. It is possible that the words in question are intended to be a fresh assertion of the mutual indwelling of the Son and the Father, and that their original form was somewhat of this kind—'manentem in se, quod etiam ipse prolatus est ab illo.' Refer to c. xv p. 50 ll. 12 sq. Or again, a reference to the Son's obedience is possible, and the word 'manente' may have usurped the place of 'mandantem.' We may in that case compare the words of Hippolytus, *c. Noet.* xiv εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ κελεύων πατήρ, ὁ δὲ ὑπακούων υἱός, τὸ δὲ ξυνετίζον ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Or possibly *auditus* may have been substituted for an original *traditum*, used in the sense observed on p. 121. 15.

INDEX I.

SUBJECTS.

INDEX II.

SCRIPTURE TEXTS.

II. TIMOTHY

HEBREWS

ST JAMES

I. PETER

II. PETER

I. JOHN

APOCALYPSE

INDEX III.

LATIN WORDS.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BR65 N4D4 1909	Novatianus Novatini de Trinitate Liber 384189
NOV 27 '33 NOV 29 '33	L. B. Matthews Colgate Hall
JAN 23 '36 MAR 29 '36	S. J. Case
JUL 29 '36 JUL 3 '36	Mary R. Bell [illegible] Court
OCT 28 '37 NOV 6 '37	S. J. Case
JUN 22 '38 JUN 25 '38	Shepherd
AUG 30 1943	S M Smith # 20
NOV 3 NOV 7 1947	W Bingham 6204 Dorchester
09 27 60 Jan 26 61	T. H. Partrick # 45